Asia Pacific Education Review
2003, Vol. 4, No. 1, 51-66.

Entering and Exiting a Teacher Preparation Program: What Happens in Between? How Do We Know Our Graduates Are Prepared to Teach?

Kay M. Sagmiller
Southern Oregon University
U.S.A.

Joan Marioni
Southern Oregon University
U.S.A.

Younghee M. Kim
Southern Oregon University
U.S.A.

In determining whether graduates of the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program at Southern Oregon University were developing the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach, faculty members found themselves examining their own practice. This is just what Goodlad (1988) suggested we do: clarify our own beliefs in order to better understand our teacher preparation program. We discovered that the development of the MAT program is primarily shaped by the people who teach within the program. Who we are as people, influences who we are as teachers and, who we are as teachers influences the nature of the teacher preparation program. This discovery underscored the importance of our efforts to steward the development of our students' personhood as well as their knowledge and skills.

Key words: teacher education, program development, pre-service teacher, teacher knowledge, skills and dispositions, professional development for professors

How do we know our graduates have gained the skills, knowledge, and dispositions to be effective teachers? This question has inspired us as a faculty to clarify our own beliefs about teaching, and examine how those beliefs are influencing our teaching, and the teacher education program at Southern Oregon University. The Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program at Southern Oregon University is in its fifth year of implementation. The one-year program is designed in response to State licensure requirements and proposes to grant graduates both a teaching license and a masters degree. The year is intense for both students and professors, and we, as a faculty, find ourselves wondering: is it possible, or even reasonable, to meet these two goals in one year?

Kay M. Sagmiller, Assistant Professor, Department of Education at Southern Oregon University; **Joan Marioni**, Assistant Professor, Southern Oregon University; **Younghee M. Kim**, Associate Professor, Southern Oregon University; Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kay M. Sagmiller, Department of Education, Southern Oregon University, 1250 Siskiyou Boulevard, Ashland, Oregon, 97520, U.S.A. Electronic mail may be sent to sagmillk @sou.edu

Ethically, we must first ask, are we sufficiently preparing our students for state licensure? Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission requires pre-service teachers to show a pattern of proficiency in five distinct areas: planning for instruction; creating a climate conducive to learning; effectively engaging all students in learning; effectively assessing student academic growth; and professional behaviors, ethics, and values. What strategies are most effective in helping students meet these competencies? And what evidence must we collect to determine our students are making continued growth in each of these areas?

- How do we determine whether a student can design standards-based curriculum?
- What does "instructional expertise" look like for a novice teacher?
- What evidence must we collect to determine our pre-service teachers have the skills to create a climate conducive to learning?
- What assessment strategies are critical for novice teachers and how do we instill the importance of

being flexible, resourceful and insightful in monitoring student progress?

- What are the professional ethics of the teaching profession? How do we screen for those dispositions? How do we assist those who are struggling with issues of professionalism?

Despite our initial concern with the degree to which our program prepares students for state licensure, Roger Soder reminds us that while licensing boards influence the nature and scope of training programs, the "…successful completion of a training program is a necessary but not a *sufficient* [italics added] condition for obtaining the right for practicing a profession" (Soder, 1988).

Planning instruction, effectively instructing, managing classrooms, and assessing student learning are critical aspects of teaching. Knowing subject content and pedagogical strategies is important, but they alone will not lead to the development of the kind of person we want our children to have as a teacher. Ayers (1993) argues that teaching is much larger and much more alive than center stage instructing to meet state standards, teaching, he writes, "contains more pain and conflict, more joy and intelligence, more uncertainty and ambiguity. It requires more judgment and energy and intensity than, on some days, seems humanly possible. Teaching is spectacularly unlimited" (p. 5). We want to develop teachers who inspire curiosity, invite students to consider new perspectives, and imagine new possibilities; we want our children to have teachers who are not only knowledgeable but also patient, compassionate, "…broad minded… curious, and enthusiastic…" (Hansen, 2001, p. 24). Hansen describes the actions that distinguish the flat and technical teacher from the dynamic and inspirational teacher and refers to them as the uncommon acts of teaching. The "uncommon actions" of inspiration, contemplation, patience, and stewardship, are at the very core of fine teaching and spring forth, not from pedagogical content knowledge, but rather from the very core of the person who is doing the teaching.

A teacher preparation program must attend to the development of both the technical or "common" aspects of teaching as well as the "uncommon acts." Helping others to become a provocative teacher requires us to be mindful not only of a novice's pedagogical and content knowledge, but we must also attend to the development of who they are as "persons."

- What kind of teachers do our students intend to be?
- In what ways do their intentions and actions align?
- What is their degree of willingness to grow and improve?

Do our pre-service teachers, in fact, have the dispositions of mind and feeling that are centered on attentiveness to their students and learning? Equally important though, we must also ask, are our dispositions as a faculty centered on attentiveness to our students and their learning? Who are *we* as people? How does *who we are* influence who we are as professors? How do we weave who we are, into what we do, so that our program as a whole is designed to intentionally steward the development of a teacher?

Literature Review

Lortie (1975) concluded that the thousands of hours that a teacher spent as a student has more influence on their socialization as a teacher than their brief teacher education experience. Still pre-service preparation programs exist, and though often guided primarily by "belief, historical tradition, and intuitions" (Yarger & Smith, 1990, p. 25), there is a hope that effective teacher programs exist and do make a difference in the development of a teacher.

James Stronge (2002) writes that if a single method for developing an effective teacher existed, such a teacher would be in every classroom. Nonetheless, there are common attributes that characterize effective teachers. Teachers have a powerful, long-lasting influence on their students. They directly affect how students learn, what they learn, how much they learn, and the ways they interact with one another and the world around them. Further, Stronge notes that "effective teaching is the result of a combination of many factors, including aspects of the teacher's background and ways of interacting with others, as well as specific teaching practices" (p.61).

David Hansen (2001) writes in his book, *Exploring the Moral Heart of Teaching*, "Good teaching involves enriching, not impoverishing, students' understandings of self, others, and the world" (pp. ix). Hansen reminds us throughout his book of the role of the person in becoming a teacher. He poses questions for the teacher educator or prospective teacher to ponder and then act upon, or as he suggests "inner reflection and outer action." Why am I teaching? How should I teach? What does teaching mean? How does one live teaching? He invites us, as teacher educators, to connect with our own practice. Similarly, Palmer (1999) guides teachers to reflect upon whether they are faithful to their life and their work. In his book, *The Courage to Teach*, Palmer writes, "Good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good

teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (p. 10). Pre-service teachers should be encouraged to be active learners and engage in experiences that challenge their thoughts. They should be given the opportunity to be creative, to reflect and analyze their own experiences with others (Gray, 2001).

Darling-Hammond (1997) argues that teacher educators, like their students, learn by studying, doing, and reflecting; "by collaborating with other students; by looking closely at students and their work; and by sharing what they see" (p. 319). Sparks (1994) argues that teachers who can communicate openly and examine taken-for-granted beliefs and assumptions foster the development of a renewing workplace; the free exchange of ideas promotes critical reflection, creativity and innovation, and develops an environment in which workers are self-directed, proactive thinkers and learners.

We, as a faculty, are in agreement with John Goodlad (1988) when he wrote, "we have been trying to clarify our own beliefs about teaching and what these might mean for [our] teacher education [program]" (p. 108). Several self-studies have been conducted by the SOU faculty over the past four years to determine the strengths and areas of growth needed in our own teaching and our MAT program. A group of professors have been meeting monthly with MAT graduates who have been in their first years of teaching. The "Beginning Teachers" study has illuminated the importance of certain course content but more importantly has confirmed the power of students and faculty maintaining long-term supportive relationships beyond graduation (Greene, Marioni, Sagmiller, Kim, Platt, & Fought, 2002). The "Reflective Trio Study," conducted by three faculty members, was designed to improve their own teaching through collaborative reflection. This study not only demonstrates the faculty's commitment to improving their own teaching, but also stands as one more indicator of the faculty's deep desire to be models for what they preach: we must study ourselves so that we can better help others to learn (Marioni, Greene, & Kim, 2001). As part of the university's efforts to reach out to students beyond the driving area of campus, several courses are now being taught via Video-teleconferencing (V-Tel). Teaching on V-Tel is a new experience for most SOU faculty and tends to be rife with both technological and pedagogical challenges. To better understand how interactive video was influencing their teaching, four SOU professors conducted a study which examined their teaching effectiveness in V-Tel classes versus face-to-face instruction (Kim, Parkinson, Marioni, & Greene, 2002). Three other on-going studies are also being conducted at SOU. One professor is engaged in an extensive self-study of her own instructional effectiveness by carefully analyzing her perceptions of teaching against those of her students and outside observers (Lau-Smith, 2002). In another study two faculty members who co-plan are examining student's perceptions of professor effectiveness. The professors then integrate data collected from students into the coursework of their action research class (Belcastro & Sagmiller, 2001). And finally, two other faculty members who team teach are examining how team teaching effects student learning (Marioni & Kim, 2002).

Perhaps most illuminating of all, is the on-going study conducted by several SOU faculty of students who fail to meet proficiency and disposition standards (Sagmiller, Marioni, Kim, & Thorpe, 2002). As a faculty we are not only interested in those who succeed, but in those who fail. Where do students stumble? Are there predictors of a pre-service teachers' success or failure? In a constructivist program, can we allow any students to fail? When we consider the children these marginal pre-service teachers will teach someday, can we morally allow them to continue in our program without intervening? If a student has the will to change, what kind of time line is reasonable and what implications will this have for a program with a cohort design? What strategies will be most effective in support of those who have the will to improve?

Cognitive Coaching strategies (Costa & Garmston, 2002) have been key in designing conferences and plans of action for struggling students. According to Sagmiller (2002), "Cognitive Coaching is a formal process of questioning, and encouraging, that helps a person clarify their intentions... so they can better match what they intend to their actions." Teaching professionals who engage in Cognitive Coaching are more reflective and think in more complex ways; as a result of their increased reflection they are better able to make changes in their practice (Costa & Garmston, 2002). School professionals must be able to work independently as well as interdependently, they must be effective not only behind closed doors with their students, but also able to work effectively with parents and colleagues as an integral part of a learning community. Costa and Garmston (2002) argue that these people are highly developed in five distinct areas. The "five states of mind" include: craftsmanship, efficacy, consciousness, flexibility, and interdependence. Craftsmanship describes all the knowledge and skills necessary to teach, this would include the first four proficiencies in the Oregon state teaching standards. Efficacy refers to a person's belief that what they do makes a difference. Consciousness is a person's

degree of self-awareness; flexibility describes their ability to see new perspectives. Interdependence describes a person's ability and willingness to work with others. Strategies and practices central to the theory of Cognitive Coaching have recently been integrated into the MAT program as tools to identify and support pre-service teachers.

Yarger and Smith (1990) argue that in order to get an "instructive" view of a teacher education program, researchers must conduct "linking studies" that illuminate three aspects of the program: the antecedent conditions, the process of the program and the outcomes. Antecedent conditions are "those environmental conditions that set the context for teacher education" (e.g., student selection, program structure, student and faculty personalogical characteristics, physical environment, political/social context) (p. 27). The "process" refers to strategies and practices used to instruct the pre-service teachers. "Outcomes" refer to the behaviors and practices of the graduates of the program. This literature review has illustrated how we are currently using both internal and external research to both evaluate and revise our teacher preparation program. It is our goal to develop a program that not only promises to develop fine teachers but also fine people.

Method

Southern Oregon University's teacher preparation program graduates an average of one hundred and ten students per year. Approximately forty percent of the students are preparing to be secondary teachers, fifty percent elementary teachers, and the remaining ten percent are preparing to teach middle school students. A full-time faculty of ten professors share the responsibility of preparing the students during the one-year intensive program. Some professors teach across all authorization levels: early childhood, elementary, middle, and high school. Other professors teach only one or two authorization levels, such as middle and high school only or early childhood and elementary. Generally three adjuncts join the faculty each year to supervise the interning teachers during their practice teaching experiences in the public schools.

Professors who teach in the MAT program meet formally at least once a month. At these meetings subcommittees are created to attend to specific planning for programmatic issues, such as designing assessment tools for student work and program evaluation; organizing events; analyzing student work, and facilitating student study teams. It is critical to note, that a great deal of informal collaboration also occurs over quick lunches, via e-mail, and in the hallways as professors hurry off to class.

Over the last four years (1998-2002) both qualitative and quantitative data have been collected for the purpose of program evaluation. Data sources include: Participant observation; historical documents; surveys; student work and performance; and additional adjacent studies conducted by faculty on the development of the program. These data sources have been analyzed to describe the students, cooperating teachers, administrators and professors' beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions of the program's effectiveness (Gall, Gall & Borg, 1999). As data are collected and analyzed, they are included in the agendas at the monthly MAT meetings. The faculty engages in ongoing evaluation of the program, but there are two specific times a year that the faculty meet to seriously consider major programmatic revisions: at the end of winter quarter and at the end of spring quarter as the faculty prepares for the upcoming academic year.

A key data source for this study is the direct participant observation of the three researchers. One author is in her fifth year of teaching in the developing program. Hired to teach in the first year of implementation, she has remained an active member of the MAT teaching faculty and served as the department chair during the fourth year of development. Another author, hired in the second year of implementation, is in her fourth year, and remains an active member in the MAT program. The last member of the research team was hired in the third year of the developing MAT program. Having served as the coordinator of the MAT during her second year at SOU, she now continues as an active faculty member in the program. All of the researchers are members of the MAT evaluation team, a committee of four professors.

Historical documents used for this study include minutes from the following types of meetings: evaluation committee minutes, bi-monthly faculty meetings, bi-monthly MAT team meetings, admissions and retention meetings and, in years four and five, student study team meetings. Reports used to describe the historical portrait of the program's development include the annual department reports to Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the 5-year Accreditation Report also submitted to Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. Minutes and evaluations from faculty retreats, cooperating teacher workshops, institutes, and "celebrations" were also analyzed for descriptions and perceptions of the program's effectiveness.

Beginning in year two, prior knowledge inventories were administered to students upon their entry to and exit from the program. Annual surveys were also administered to cooperating teachers and administrators. In the fourth year of the program's development, professors' perceptions of the

program were formalized into reflective essays and submitted to the evaluation team for analysis.

Four years of student course work and field performance was analyzed for student's competency in each of the five state-required proficiencies as well as for evidence of the six program dispositions (demonstrates an ethic of caring; functions as a researcher and learner; manifests traits of collaboration and leadership; demonstrates awareness and respect for diversity; works as a reflective decision maker; communicates effectively in speaking, writing, and through technology). 'Professional portfolios,' 'formal teaching observations', and 'work samples' from all four years were reviewed and analyzed for evidence of students' competency levels. In addition, students' action research projects from years two through four and selected student e-mail messages were also analyzed.

Additionally, ongoing research conducted by the MAT faculty has provided critical data and insights for this study; these studies are described in the literature review section.

There are several terms used throughout this paper that are unique to the SOU Master of Arts in Teaching Program. The definition of terms are as follows:

- Professional Portfolios: Throughout the program, students collect artifacts that provide evidence of their professional growth in each of the proficiencies and dispositions. Each artifact is followed by a self-reflective essay in which the student explains why that particular artifact is appropriate evidence of their growth. Guided by a rubric (Appendix A), reflections and artifacts are organized into a "professional portfolio" which, at the end of spring term, is presented, defended, and celebrated before a panel of faculty members and peers.
- Formal Observations: Several formal observations of a pre-service teachers' performance are conducted by supervisors throughout the year. In general, a formal observation includes a pre-conference discussion, the viewing of a 30-45 minute lesson, and a post-lesson reflective discussion. During the process, supervisors collect evidence of the pre-service teachers' degree of competency in each proficiency area and record the data on a form (Appendix B). Copies of these formal observations remain in students' permanent files; additional copies are forwarded to the State for licensure requirements.
- Work Sample: Oregon state law requires that all those who wish to pursue Oregon state licensure must show evidence of planning and implementing a two week (minimum length) instructional unit for each authorization level. These units must be aligned to state learning standards and provide evidence of student progress. Using an extensive rubric as a guide (Appendix C). MAT students write one "work sample" for each of the two quarters they student teach.
- September Experience: Immediately following five weeks of intense summer coursework pre-service teachers are placed in the schools with cooperating teachers. For approximately six weeks students stay on-site with the children; this autumn full-time practicum is referred to as "September Experience."
- Practicum: During late September students return to the university to attend classes. Their time in the public school classroom drops to an average of two hours per day. This part-time field experience is referred to as the "practicum." The primary purpose of the practicum is to give supervisors and cooperating teachers an opportunity to observe the pre-service teachers in the naturalistic environment and determine whether they have the dispositions and initial prior knowledge to fulfill the role of teacher.
- Student Teaching: In January pre-service teachers are placed in the public schools for half-day student teaching. They return to the university in the afternoon to attend coursework. In March, pre-service teachers participate in full-day student teaching and attend only one 3 credit course on campus.

Findings and Discussion

This paper discusses only the first question in our ongoing evaluation of the newly emerging MAT program: Have our graduates gained the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to be effective teachers?

We don't know…and our ability to discern which students did and those who may not have (and why) has shifted as the program developed. During the first two years of the MAT program, professors were so preoccupied with the management of the program and their own personal survival that they were not as able attend to their students' intellectual growth as they intended. The early MAT professors were torn between just making it through the year and their deep desire to adequately prepare future teachers. It may have been this moral, as well as physical, tension of continually having to

decide between caring for "self" (their own health and wellness) or caring for others (their students' progress) that drove some professors from the MAT program.

Over the course of five years, the development of the MAT program has been confronted with a high level of faculty and administrative turn over. While reasons why faculty members left the program vary, the degree of turnover is high. Interestingly, it is unclear how this high staff turn over has influenced the development of the program. Despite the shift in personalities, or perhaps *because* of the shift in personalities, significant organizational improvements were, and continue, to be made. Faculty turnover, however, has plateaued over the past three years. Why?

Clearly, the program itself has been in a continual process of development. Despite the extremely demanding management challenges of the first year, some faculty members experienced a sense of excitement: they were creating something new and novel. This sense of anticipation was shared by the first year MAT students as well; it translated into a general mood of "we're all in this together, so let's roll with the punches." The anticipation of creating something potentially great, coupled with the general degree of "forgiveness" of the first year students, encouraged two of the original five professors to stay in the program. Despite the challenges of the first year, they had hope that things would improve.

As the MAT program continued into its second and third year though, there was a steady drop in both faculty and student satisfaction with the program. Professors were continuing to design the program simultaneous to its implementation. The time allotted for faculty collaboration was insufficient to address the number of complex issues requiring attention. The strategy of creating subcommittees began to work against the cohesion of the faculty and the consistency of the program. By the third year, some students were beginning to use the lack of consistency in practices to their advantage: they worked the loosely-coupled system to meet their needs just as a child works two parents against each other. Approximately ten percent of the students became aggressive towards professors and colleagues. They were confrontational, arrogant, deceitful; rude and disrespectful. The scenarios vary, but the tone and message were clear. For example, one male student consistently refused to buy course texts, interrupted and challenged professors during classes, handed in extremely poor quality work, and vocally complained throughout the local community that MAT professors were unqualified and unfair. Such negative behaviors influenced the whole cohort, and like a contagious disease, the discontent among all, grew. Frustrations increased between faculty members, between students, and between the faculty and the students. Despite the challenging tone, student work and practice teaching indicated that the majority of the MAT students were learning key pedagogical knowledge and skills. Cooperating teachers and principals reported in the annual surveys that there was a continued improvement in the caliber of students graduating from the MAT. Equally important, the faculty was now better able to identify those few students who were not progressing as intended; those students who had "problematic" behaviors, or dispositions, stood out from the rest of the cohort.

Data from the second and third year of implementation clearly showed that negative professional behaviors could, and would, emerge in a cohort, unless explicit attention was given to the development and maintaining of positive professional ethics. In year four, two particularly like-minded professors held the positions of department chair and MAT coordinator. They lead the revision of the "opening activities" for the new cohort and directly addressed issues of professionalism. Students wrote a cohort-wide code of professional ethics and as the year progressed they reflected upon their developing professional reputations. There was a clear positive shift in tone within the MAT program during year four.

The MAT program has had distinct stages of development during its four years of implementation. In the initial stages the program was haunted by managerial challenges, unclear mandated state requirements, and a high percentage of newly hired faculty.

Curiously, we have found that newly hired professors also experience a sequence of stages similar to a developing program. A professors' first year of teaching in the MAT program is traditionally plagued by ambiguity and frustration; they are overwhelmed with details, responsibilities, workload, and the general unknown. In addition, many professors have struggled with the idea that a one-year initial teachers licensure program also grants a masters degree. Many argue that it is not realistic, or appropriate, to hold pre-service teachers to the rigor necessary for a "true" masters degree. Some professors are so adamant about this point that they choose not to teach in the program. Despite the faculty's efforts to mentor newcomers, the first year of teaching in the MAT program could almost be viewed as an "initiation." It is not for the timid.

As the program developed over the years, managerial issues became less of a concern. Simultaneously, a small cohort of faculty members passed through their initiation stage, and became more "settled" in their roles as professors. With a

Table 1. *SOU MAT Professor Stages of Development*

Year of Program	Stage One (1998-2000)	Stage Two (2000-2001)	Stage Three (2001-2002)
Professors 98-00	Will we survive?	Is there a better way?	What are our students learning?
Professors 2000		Will we survive?	Is there a better way?
Professors 2001			Will we survive?

retrieved sense of efficacy they were finally able to look toward the needs of their students...and to the criteria required to evaluate their progress.

Students' reactions to the program have been influenced by both the degree of program development and the professors' capacity to attend to their needs; not just their academic needs but also, as Hansen writes, the "emergence of [their] personhood."

In the program's second year of implementation SOU professors became involved in a state-wide grant designed specifically to help Oregon teacher education institutions discuss common ways to assess pre-service teacher development. Participation in this grant spurred the MAT

Table 2. *Phases of SOU Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program Development: From 1998 to present*

	Program Development	Professors	Students
Gearing up 97-98	Reconceptualization task force at SOU		
Year One: 98-99 *"What are we supposed to be doing?"*	*The Guinea Pig Year* - Five new faculty members hired/one resigned - Associate Dean retired - Development of Portfolio process as a method of monitoring student progress - Program continues to be under construction - Celebration of Cooperating Teachers: conscious effort to reach out to public schools	*Year of Survival* - Lack of planning time resulted in low level of collegiality - Faculty health problems - Mismatched teams of instructors - Faculty roles: guides; supervisors; instructors - No program coordinator	*Year of Perseverance* - Student frustration high - Forgiveness level high - Students question the rationale for performance tasks: work sample, portfolio, and action research
Year Two: 99-00 *"Is this how you do it?"*	*The Toddler Year* - Four new faculty members hired/three resigned - Interim Associate Dean assigned - Revision of work sample guidelines begins	*Year of Trial and Error* - Oregon Quality Assurance in Teaching (O-QAT) grant provided opportunities for professors to meet and begin to collaborate about program design - Program coordinator assigned	*Year of Ambiguity* - Students continued to show signs of frustration because of lack of clarity regarding program expectations - Level of forgiveness is less than year one
Year Three: 00-01 *"What are we doing?"* *"What are the students doing and why?"*	*The Accreditation Year* - Two new faculty members hired/one resigned - New Associate Dean hired - New Department Chair - One faculty on sabbatical - Revised work sample guidelines - Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) accreditation process	*Year of Challenges* - Reflective Trio Self-study - Beginning Teachers Study - Increased consciousness of negative norms forming in cohorts - O-QAT grant continues - Faculty faced with several students' unprofessional behaviors - Faculty concerns grow about their ability to hold students to "high expectations"	*Year of Frustration* - Student frustration high with lack of programmatic organization - Low level of forgiveness - Some vocal students exhibited overt unprofessional behaviors

Table 2. *Continued*

	Program Development	Professors	Students
Year Four: 01-02 Year of positive persistent disturbance *"Let's hold students accountable."*	*The Year of Progress* - Three new faculty members hired/one resigned after fall - Professional ethics emphasized with students - Student study team process designed and implemented - Leadership by like-minded coordinator & department chair push for curricular change: aligning coursework and setting philosophical rationale for decisions - Professional norms are incorporated throughout program - Integrated K-12 groups met at the end of each term - Increased alignment of coursework: Action Research; Curriculum Instruction and Assessment; Special Methods	*Year of Rejuvenation & Action* - Identified and intervened with students who had concerning patterns of behaviors - Presentation at ORATE on the use of student study teams to assist and address struggling students - Program evaluation committee established - Increased focus on admissions process - Effort by faculty to connect coursework with fieldwork experiences - Increased sense of moral obligation to the children, faculties, and principals, who will be working with these future teachers - First teacher institute	*Year of Openness* - Frustration level drops - Efforts to understand and craft a professional reputation increase - Demonstration of professionalism remains an issue for some students - Students become more aware of what it means to be professional teacher - Prospective students with questionable professionalism re-interviewed for admittance to the MAT program
Year Five: 02-03 "With an eye to the future…future teachers and their future students"	*The Reflective Year* - Philosophical differences result in program division: elementary and secondary - New department chair - New coordinator for 1,2,3 program; two coordinators for the 3/4 program - Infusion of new knowledge: Hansen's book "The Moral Heart of Teaching" - Program policy and procedure clarification	*Year of Reflection* - Greater concern for our pre-service teachers and the children they will eventually serve - Refining student study team process in elementary, middle level program - Increased focus on assessing dispositions - Pockets of high trust among faculty has led to collaborative planning and research projects	*Year of Optimism* - Drop in student frustration - Increase in students' willingness to understand before being critical - Emphasis on becoming a person/teacher

faculty to begin scrutinizing the methods they were using to monitor student achievement. Now in year five, partly as a result of the participation in the grant, and partly due to the tenacious commitment of the faculty to model best practices, the professors have refined and broadened their constellation of assessment tools to monitor pre-service teacher progress.

This extensive model for monitoring student progress, coupled with the faculty's increased attentiveness to students' professional behavior, illuminated the importance of increasing the assessment of ethics and dispositions. Prior to year four the importance of professional dispositions was implied but not emphasized; the only time they were formally assessed was at the end of the year in the students' professional portfolios.

Now ethics and professionalism are an explicit part of the MAT curriculum: directly taught and assessed by the faculty. In addition, a process has been developed to support students who struggle with issues of professionalism (or with any of the other proficiencies). When a professor has a concern about a student's progress, the concern becomes an agenda item for the monthly MAT planning meeting. Faculty members analyze and discuss the student's performance in both the field and coursework. Based on the data of the student's performance program-wide, the faculty determines whether that student should be "called in" for a Student Study Team Conference. During a conference the faculty uses Cognitive Coaching strategies to determine the student's degree of

Table 3. *Assessment of Student Progress*

Oregon Teaching Proficiencies	Course work/ Evidence	Assessment	Fieldwork/ Performance	Assessment
P1. Effective plans and implements instruction that supports student progress	1. Work sample development 2. Action research project 3. Professional portfolio	1. Rubric 2. Presentation & Rubric 3. Presentation & Rubric	1. Work sample implementation 2. Implement research plan of action	
P2. Creates a classroom climate conducive to learning	1. Classroom management plan 2. Professional portfolio	1. Self-assessment 2. Portfolio Rubric	1 & 2. Integration of classroom management skills to meet the needs of diverse learners	University Supervisor and cooperating teacher observation conferences & reports
P3. Engages learners in planned learning activities	1. Unit & lesson development 2. Action research project 3. Professional portfolio	1. Rubric, peer feedback & Self assessment 2. Self-assessment/ presentation 3. Portfolio Rubric	1. Integration of research based strategies and practices 2. Implement research plan of action	Three-way collaborative assessment conferences each term
P4. Assesses, evaluates & reports students' learning	1. Unit& lesson development using multiple assessment strategies 2. Professional portfolio	1. Rubric (Prior knowledge inventory) 2. Portfolio Rubric (Analysis of lesson implementation)	1. Implement unit plan 2. Student teachers' self reflection/analysis	Student teacher self reflective journal Student work resulting from student teacher's instruction
P5. Exhibits professional behaviors, ethics and values	1. Professional behaviors are integrated into all required coursework 2. Group norming activity 3. Professional portfolio	1 & 2. Professors'& peers' observations; Reflective essays; Student Study team; Admission & Retention; Action plans 3. Portfolio Rubric	1 & 2. Pattern of professionalism exhibited throughout the year with all professional colleagues and community members	Observational data and conferences; Student Study team; Admission & Retention; Action Plans

consciousness of the problem; match the data regarding the student's performance with the student's intentions; and identify the student's degree of will to make necessary changes. Often, as a result of these discussions, students are placed on a "plan of action" which includes specific goals for improvement, identifies data that must be collected as evidence of growth, and sets time lines for review of the student's progress. Eight out of the ten students invited to attend a "student study team" in year four made remarkable progress in their professional *and* personal growth. The two students who did not make progress in their plans were referred to the "Admission and Retention" committee; a committee that reviews the student's progress, and has the official power to ask a student to leave the teacher preparation program.

Conducting Student Study Teams takes a great deal of time; they require faculty members to collect and analyze data on specific individuals, attend more meetings, make more phone calls, and engage in increased student advising and supervision. Why would faculty members willingly add this additional responsibility to their already stressful workload?

The professors' hunch about the importance of attending to certain dispositions in the development of a teacher was confirmed when they had the opportunity to hear and read David Hansen's work (2001). His inspiring definition of the uncommon acts of teaching not only called us to reflect upon our own practice, but reminded us of the moral obligation we have to the future children our pre-service teachers may someday teach. He confirmed our efforts to pay attention to what we do as teacher preparation professionals and reinforced our notion that attending to the development of pre-service teachers' character and personhood is every bit as important as attending to the development of their pedagogical knowledge and skills.

By incorporating the Student Study Team process into the ongoing assessment of pre-service teachers, the faculty members have woven themselves into the fabric of the program. Recommending that a person not be allowed to teach children is a decision this faculty takes very seriously. We cannot, however, ignore the moral implications of knowingly graduating a person who, not only has questionable knowledge, skills and dispositions, but also lacks the will to improve. Allowing unqualified people into the profession we so deeply love and respect, is in direct opposition to our teaching ideals. The MAT program is no longer simply a series of courses and activities, but instead, has the potential of being a life changing experience for both our students and professors. The process requires us as a faculty to clarify our own beliefs about what it means to be a teacher; to question our own perceptions of student actions; and to proceed with the intention of caring for not only our pre-service teachers, but also for the children who may be their future students. The process calls into the limelight the moral as well as pedagogical importance of modeling the characteristics we wish to instill in our pre-service teachers: *we* want to be teachers who inspire curiosity, invite students to consider new perspectives, and imagine new possibilities; we must not only be knowledgeable but also patient and compassionate.

Conclusions and Implications

This study illuminated several key issues related to the development of teacher preparation programs.

- Newly designed programs develop over time. Without careful planning managerial issues will dominate the first years of implementation. Swept up in issues of survival, professors may not have the time and energy to attend to the critical issue of intentionally developing a "program culture." Those engaged in planning new programs are advised to anticipate the need for additional resources in the first years of implementation; include experienced professors on the faculty (as well as newcomers); provide additional staff support to the faculty; plan additional collaborative time for faculty to attend to both issues of management as well as to the intentional development of "school culture," and expect that the program will emerge and develop over time.
- Program improvement is a recursive process reliant upon multiple data sources. Of the many data sources used in this study, the most significant has been the analysis of student work. It was through the review of students' professional portfolios, work samples, and their supervised teaching, that professors were best able to determine what was working in the program, and what wasn't.
- Professional ethics must be an explicit part of a teacher preparation program. For the past three years we have identified approximately ten percent of our students who struggle with the development of professional dispositions. If we do not attend to these students' need for additional guidance and accountability, the integrity of the whole program is affected. Equally important, the direct instruction of ethics, underscores our collective commitment to the unseen children these future teachers may someday serve: children deserve to be taught by caring, well-mannered professionals.

In our pursuit to better understand whether our graduates have gained the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach, we have found ourselves deeply examining our own practice. This is just what Goodlad (1988) suggested we do: clarify our beliefs in order to better understand our teacher preparation program. The process of continual reflection and analysis is humbling; it requires a deep commitment to both our students and to the children they may someday serve. Negotiating this tension is often precarious; answers are not always clear. Yet, this is the very environment Hansen (2001) recommends we create to facilitate learning: a place of discourse and "positive potentiality."

References

Ayers, W. (1993). *To teach the journey of a teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Belcastro, A. & Sagmiller, K. (2001) *Students' perceptions of professor acceptance of professor effectiveness.* Unpublished Research Study, Southern Oregon University, Ashland, OR.

Costa A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (2002). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (1999). *Applying educational research: A practical guide* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Gary, K. C. (2001). Changing classrooms by treating teachers as active learners. *Middle School Journal, 32*(3), 15-19.

Greene, W. L., Marioni, J., Sagmiller, K., Kim, Y. M., Platt, J., & Fought, S. (2002, August). *A self-model for reflective inquiry: Teacher educators and classroom teachers examine critical issues of mutual interest*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Fourth International Conference on Self-Study of Teacher Practices. Sussex, England.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). Studying the education of educators: Values-driven inquiry. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 105-111.

Hansen, D. T. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching: Toward a teacher's creed*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kim, Y. M., Parkinson, D., Marioni, J. L., & Greene, W. L. (2002, March). *Vision of V-Tel, distance education: Will I have to teach this again?* Paper presented at the meeting of the 5th Annual Conference of Oregon Association of Teacher Educators. Portland, OR

Lau-Smith, J. (2002, May). *Taking "action" in action research*. Paper presented at the Scholarship of Teaching Conference by the Center for Teaching and Learning of Southern Oregon University, Ashland, OR.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marioni, J. L., & Kim, Y. M. (2002, May). *Transforming our practice: The power of team teaching*. Paper presented at the Scholarship of Teaching Conference by the Center for Teaching and Learning of Southern Oregon University, Ashland, OR.

Marioni, J. L., Kim, Y. M., & Greene, W. L. (2002, April). *Action research and reflective practice: Modeling for our students.* Paper presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Palmer, P. (1997). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Franscio: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sagmiller, K. M. (2002, October). *Supporting the development of effective teacher*. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Teacher Institute, Southern Oregon University, Ashland, OR.

Sagmiller, K. M., Marioni, J. L., Kim, Y. M., & Thorpe, S. (2002, March). *Ethics and grace: Ensuring quality professionalism in pre-service preparation.* Paper presented at the 5th Annual Conference of Oregon Association of Teacher Educators, Portland, OR.

Soder, R. (1988). Studying the education of educators: What we can learn from other professions. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 299-305.

Sparks, D. (1994). A paradigm shift in staff development. *Journal of Staff Development, 15*(4), 26-29.

Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Yarger, S. J., & Smith, P. L. (1990). Issues in research on teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*, (pp. 25-41). New York: Macmillan.

Received March 3, 2003
Revision received June 14, 2003
Accepted July 2, 2003

APPENDIX A. *SOU MAT Portfolio Rubric*

Portfolio Assessment

Student Name: _____ Date: _____ Sub-cohort: _____ Faculty Guide: _____

E =Exceptional
Highly imaginative creative; demonstrates critical thought leading to greater self-understanding; combines evidence/artifacts to show growth; unique, substantial application to own teaching; goes above and beyond requirements; demonstrates both breadth and depth; shows individual's personality; professional in presentation and appearance; demonstrates considerable effort.

T= Thorough
Well organized and complete; effectively and clearly presented; shows some originality and may combine evidence/artifacts to show growth; applies what has been learned to the classroom; clearly shows connections among complex variables involved in teaching; thoughtful and supported with ideas.

N = Needs Additional Work
Meets minimum requirements; includes general descriptive detail; some application to teaching; little evidence of originality; lacks evidence of progressive insights and growth. Narratives explain the evidence /artifacts included and their importance in establishing competency, though may be weak in synthesizing/evaluating the complex dynamics of teaching.

U = Unsatisfactory
Missing evidence or information; poorly organized; demonstrates surface understandings; no evidence of application to teaching. Some reflectivity, though may do little to show personal insights or growth related to teaching and learning.

TEACHING PROFICIENCIES	**RATING**	**COMMENTS**
P1 Plan instruction that supports student progress in learning and is appropriate for the developmental level		
P2 Establish a classroom climate conducive to learning		
P3 Engage students in planned learning activities		
P4 Evaluate, act upon, and report student progress in learning		
P5 Exhibit professional behaviors		
AUTHORIZATION PROFICIENCIES	**RATING**	**COMMENTS**
A1 Document understanding and apply knowledge of developmental psychology and learning appropriate to students designated at their authorization level within the cultural and community contexts of the teacher education institution and cooperating school districts		
A2 Articulate and apply a philosophy of education which is appropriate to the students in their authorization level and which ensures that students learn to think critically and integrate subject matter across disciplines		
A3 Document broad knowledge of the subject matter to enable students to meet state and district standards		
A4 Complete all levels of student teaching		
SOU PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITION PROFICIENCIES	**RATING**	**COMMENTS**
D1 Demonstrate the ethic of caring		
D2 Function as a researcher and learner		
D3 Manifest traits of collaboration and leadership		
D4 Demonstrate awareness and respect for diversity		
D5 Work as a reflective decision maker		
D6 Communicate effectively in speaking, writing, and through technology		

For licensure recommendation from Southern Oregon University, students must achieve a rating of "T" (Thorough) or "E" (Exceptional) on <u>each</u> item.

Based on the above ratings, this portfolio ____ passes ____ does not pass (check one). Faculty Guide Signature _____ Date _____0

APPENDIX B. *SOU MAT Preservice Observation Form*

FORMAL OBSERVATION FORM
Master of Arts in Teaching

Winter_____ **Spring**_____

Student_____ Time/Date_____

Class/Subject Observed_____ chool_____

RATING Beginning __ Exploring __ Developing __ Ref/Apply __	P1: Plans instruction that supports student progress in learning and is appropriate for the developmental level. Evidence:
RATING Beginning __ Exploring __ Developing __ Ref/Apply __	P2: Establishes a classroom climate conducive to learning. Evidence:
RATING Beginning __ Exploring __ Developing __ Ref/Apply __	P3: Engages students in planned learning activities. Evidence:
RATING Beginning __ Exploring __ Developing __ Ref/Apply __	P4: Evaluates, acts upon, and reports student progress in learning. Evidence:
RATING Beginning __ Exploring __ Developing __ Ref/Apply __	P5: Exhibits professional behaviors, ethics, and values. Evidence:

Additional Comments:

_____ _____

Supervisor/Cooperating Teacher Student Date Reviewed

White: student file Yellow: student Pink: supervisor

APPENDIX C. *SOU MAT Work Sample Rubric*

SOU MAT Work Sample Guidelines

DIRECTIONS: All items on the rubric are required by the Oregon Administrative Rules Standards for Initial Teaching Licenses as outlined in Chapter 584, Division 60, Rule 40. Use the rubric to guide your work and include all sections. Use pseudonyms, maintain confidentiality throughout the unit. Work submitted must be proofread and edited for formal evaluation by university professors as partial fulfillment for a Masters degree and an Initial Oregon State Teaching License.

	Description and Organizing Questions	Adequately Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria
I. Cover Page	*One page with the required information*	Title and integrating concept; Author; Grade Level/Content Area	
II. Table of Contents	*Use as many pages as necessary to meet the requirements*	Organized format; headings sequenced; Page numbers correspond with contents	
III. Rationale	*Clearly address the following questions*		
	1. What are the knowledge and skills that are imbedded in the concept you are teaching? 2. Why is this concept important for students to learn? 3. What are the values and diversity issues that are embedded in this concept?	Narrative essay addressing all 3 questions; narrative essay addresses the concept only (how you're going to teach it comes under section 5.) This section should not be in the first person; do not use "I."	Explain how this concept applies to the world beyond the classroom
IV. Instructional Setting	*Use the "Instructional Setting Descriptor" to guide you in your work. (See attached)*	Narrative descriptive essay meets all required criteria; Subtitles clearly headed with bold face type	Data analyzed and interpreted; analytical and interpretive summary paragraph (with support data) explains how the values and priorities of the school reflects those of the larger community
V. Instruction *A. General Overview*	*Thoroughly and clearly address following questions*	Narrative form	Narrative format is supported with graphic organizers
General Overview	• What Oregon standards and benchmarks are addressed in this integrated unit? • In what ways are the unit goals aligned to the OR standards? • How do you intend to link one lesson to another so that the students see the reasons why they are doing what they are doing? • How do the lessons address diversity issues parent involvement and community partnerships?	Standards from at least two content areas are addressed Unit goals & objectives clearly defined Lessons are intentionally linked (through questions, discussions, activities, and assessments) to one another in such a way that the learners can easily see how the two content areas complement and inform each other Diversity (e. g., social, cultural, economic, linguistic, exceptional learning differences, etc.) is addressed, as well as adaptations and modifications made for these learners	Standards from more than two content areas are addressed Career related learning standards are addressed in the unit

APPENDIX C. *Continued*

	Description and Organizing Questions	**Adequately Meets Criteria**	**Exceeds Criteria**
B. Prior nowledge Inventory	*Provide examples, data, and a narrative description of outlined criteria*		
Prior Knowledge Inventory	• In what ways will you assess what the students <u>already</u> know? • In what ways did you use the pre-assessment data to develop the unit?	Assessment of students' prior knowledge is conducted <u>prior to any unit planning</u> Assessment tools are used to determine what students currently DO know Provide evidence that you have built upon students' prior knowledge not simply added new decontextualized knowledge	Use a variety of assessment tools (3 or more) to adequately determine what students <u>currently</u> know Provide evidence of collaboration with cooperating teacher/specialists in determining students' strengths and areas of need
Planning and writing lessons	***In this section you will*** • *provide lesson plans that include all required elements* • *provide narrative explanations of each question* • *provide a parent letter that explains the upcoming unit goals and in what ways parents/guardians may support their child's learning*		
Planning and writing lessons	In what ways are each of the lesson objectives related to the Oregon standards? In what ways do the instructional strategies reflect "best practices?" See "learning pyramid and "summary of the recommendations..." How have you determined that the lessons are developmentally appropriate? <u>Lesson Plan Elements</u> • Title of the lesson • The Oregon standards • Unit goals • Lesson objective(s) • Grade level • Approximate time needed to complete the lesson • Knowledge and skills necessary to complete the lesson • Materials/resources • Teaching/learning activities • Assessments • Adaptations and modifications	8-12 lessons, to be taught within a 2-5 week period, which include all the required lesson plan elements Reading and writing is integrated throughout the unit Copy of the parent/guardian letter that explains the upcoming unit goals and in what ways parents/guardians may support their child's learning Lessons are intentionally linked to one another (through questions, discussions, activities, and assessments) in such a way that the learners can easily see how the two content areas complement and inform each other Teaching strategies are based on best practices A variety of teaching strategies are used throughout the unit *FORMATIVE (on-going) assessments are aligned to the objectives* There is evidence you made modifications and reflections during the teaching of the lesson (notes, reflections, and recommendations on the lesson plan itself) Reflective notes formalized into a paragraph which addresses the modifications and adaptations you made during teaching	A calendar is created for the implementation of the unit: including the day and date; the time of day and duration of the lesson. This calendar is shared with your guide and your cooperating teacher Show where, in the lesson plan, you carried out the objectives

APPENDIX C. *Continued*

	Description and Organizing Questions	**Adequately Meets Criteria**	**Exceeds Criteria**
VI. Post Assessment	*Include a narrative essay that addresses each question below; summarizes students academic progress; and provide examples of how you communicated student progress to students and their guardians*		
Post Assessment	*Considering your unit goals and the Oregon standards, what evidence do you have that all the students learned what you intended they would learn in this unit?* Is there evidence that some students learned less than others? If so, explain why. In what ways have you communicated student progress to the learners? To their parent(s) or guardians? Reflect upon the link between the students' classroom behavior and their learning?	Narrative description of each student's growth (for one class only) which includes a thorough description of each student's learning strengths, the gains he/she made within the unit, and recommendations of next steps for the learner Group progress, supported by summative assessments, (e.g., student self assessment; student work; observations; portfolio data; presentations; projects, etc.) is summarized and suggestions are made for next steps; link is made between classroom behavior and student learning *Provide a copy of the strategy you used to communicate student progress to guardians and cooperating teachers* (e. g. letter home; progress report, etc.)	Include students' self assessment of their learning Display student progress data in more than one manner (use a graphic organizer) You and your students have communicated what was learned to the larger community: the school, the district, the town.
VII. Unit Analysis	*Include an analytic essay that answers the following questions*		
Unit analysis	To what degree did you meet the intended unit goals? What additional learning occurred during the unit (unexpected; surprising; unanticipated outcomes)?	Conduct an in-depth analysis of what you planned, what learning occurred for your students and for yourself. Include a clear discussion of the connection between the goals, implementation, and student outcomes. Support your claims with evidence. Given the data you have collected during the implementation stage, what ideas do you have about how you would improve the unit in the future?	Summarize and reflect upon guardians' and community members' responses/ feedback to the unit Summarize and reflect upon students' responses/ feedback to the unit Analyze your use of assessment throughout the unit
VIII. Resources	*Include copies or descriptions of resources and materials*	Include copies of assessments, teaching materials, or descriptions of teaching materials, guest speakers, movie titles, web sites, etc. Rather than using names of guest speakers, use a person's job description.	Provide an annotated list of resources you consulted that are beyond the readily available resources from the classroom and the university. For example: ESD, regional labs, professional organizations, web sites
IX. Appendices	*Include samples of student work, photos, miscellaneous information related to the unit*	Only include artifacts in the appendices that are cited in your unit and/or reflections; clearly label all appendices	