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(ABSTRACT)

Recent calls for reform in teacher education have included improving the clinical experience of preservice teachers (Boyer, 1983; The Holmes Group, 1986). Research on student teaching indicates that the role of the cooperating teacher is of critical importance to the clinical experience (Tabachnick, 1980; Haberman, 1978). Problems exist, however, in communication gaps between higher education and the public schools (O'Shea, 1984); in the selection of cooperating teachers (Griffin, 1981); and in their preparation for assisting novices in the development of knowledge about teaching and learning (Griffin, 1983; Kleinsasser, 1988). Early clinical supervision models (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969) have been presented through top-down approaches. Literature on teachers as a cultural group (Lortie, 1975) provides some insight into why such approaches have not been successful and why cooperating teachers have not come to see themselves as teacher educators.
This interpretive study focused on the involvement of four cooperating teachers in the first year of a state-funded, collaborative inservice project in clinical supervision sponsored jointly by the college of education of a major state university and the education department of a nearby private liberal arts college. Data collection consisted of interviews with the teachers, observations in their classrooms and at Project sessions, samples of written responses to Project tasks, and samples from their talk with their student teachers. A variation of Erickson's analytic narrative method (1986) was used to analyze data and to report findings.

Findings include a description of this interactive approach to clinical supervision as it was carried out in the first year of the Project and reports on the four cases, including these teachers' views of teaching and learning and how participation in the Project informed their work as teachers and as teacher educators. The responses of these four teachers to Project tasks and discussion topics and the extent to which they came to see themselves as teacher educators are reported, along with suggestions for further research on interactive approaches to inservice in clinical supervision.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When I was a high school English teacher in the 1970s, inservice training sessions were occasionally arranged for the faculty by the building principal. Sometimes I was allowed to be absent due to extensive involvement with extra-curricular activities. On those days, I felt rewarded for those long hours I put in working with groups of students after school. At other times, however, there was no excuse, and I dutifully filed into the library with my fellow teachers. I remember enjoying the opportunity to socialize before the speaker began. I do not remember anything of the content of those Wednesday afternoon sessions -- except one transparency of Bloom's Taxonomy of Levels of Thinking. The presentations were more to be endured than they were enduring or endearing.

Then, after participating in a National Writing Project Summer Institute in 1979, I gave an inservice presentation on "Writing Across the Curriculum." Later, I was dismayed when a math teacher happily told me she had assigned a term paper on a mathematician. I had thought I was talking about ways to learn math through writing. She thought I meant she should teach her students to write papers related to math.
In the fall of 1983 I invited several elementary school teachers in my division to meet with me about twice each month to talk about how writing could be a tool for learning in all subject areas. In the two years of that Writing-to-Learn Project (Alvine, 1987), I became absolutely convinced that top-down attempts at educational change are futile. The way to effect change in teachers' practice is first to find a way to change their perspective. It is only then that they will come to new perceptions about learning which will affect their beliefs and, eventually, their practice.

This, then, is the background that I brought to a state-funded inservice project in clinical supervision that was a joint effort of the department of education of Highlands College*, where I was an instructor, and nearby Allegheny State University*, where I was a doctoral student. Among the faculty members from the two institutions who wrote the grant proposal and who implemented the Project, there was tacit agreement from the beginning that the sessions were to be collaborative. Rather than telling Project participants ways to effectively supervise student teachers, we were to learn with them about the student teaching experience. Thus, the cooperating teachers

*Highlands College and Allegheny State University are pseudonyms. Pseudonyms are used throughout to provide anonymity and validity.
selected were increasingly to share responsibility for decisions about the content of the first year sessions and, eventually, about the shape and direction of the second year of the Project.

The Project, then, was based on certain assumptions about inservice education for cooperating teachers and the nature of interactions among participants in such an interactive, collaborative model. First, if provided time and stimulus for talk about the student teaching experience with colleagues, cooperating teachers would move to a meta-perspective on their work with beginners. Second, having input into shaping the intentions and directions of the Project would help the participants develop ownership of the Project and of their learning within it. Finally, the increase in time and attention given to their work as cooperating teachers would cause their sense of themselves as teacher educators to become more important to the participants.

BACKGROUND

Historical Context

This study focused on a state-funded inservice project that addresses three problems in education that were identified nearly twenty years ago: 1) the need for
improvement in the preparation of teachers; 2) the lack of external validation of good teaching through recognition and reward; and 3) the gap in communication between the public schools and higher education.

In the early 1970s, researchers in England began calling for the reform of teacher education (Burgess, 1971). The Bullock Report (1975), outlined recommendations for the improvement of student teaching. That same year in Schoolteacher, Dan Lortie described the work of the public school teacher in this country as being characterized by isolation from other adults, a relative lack of autonomy, and a relative lack of technical knowledge about teaching. Various researchers have pointed to the gap between the different levels of education (Griffin, 1987). Others (Hoy and Rees, 1977) have described the teacher education programs in most colleges and universities as focusing on the ideal rather than on the real.

In the educational reform decade of the 1980s, various task forces and commissions studied the problems of the educational system and made suggestions for changes. A recommendation common to many of the reform reports (Boyer, 1983; Sizer, 1984, and others) was that ways should be found to recognize and reward excellence in teaching through career ladders, merit pay, or other types of master teacher
programs. In the area of teacher education, two of the four recommendations of the Holmes Group (1986) were (1) improvement of the quality of and an increased amount of field experience and (2) the development of linkages between higher education and the public schools.

O'Shea (1984) found that inservice teachers tend to agree with these two recommendations of the Holmes Group. Her report, part of an extensive study on the student teaching experience conducted at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas, Austin (Griffin, 1983), cites the products of teacher education programs as criticizing (1) the disjuncture between the theoretical content of courses at the university and the actual day-to-day demands on teachers in schools and (2) the practical component of teacher education (i.e., student teaching) as being inadequate.

In the second half of the 1980s, educational reform became a political issue as many state governors and legislators became involved in the dialogue, calling for increased pay for teachers, higher standards for high school graduation, and the restructuring of teacher education programs. In some states funds were allocated to support such reforms.
In the 1987-1989 biennium, all teacher education programs in Virginia were required to restructure themselves along guidelines established by a State Ad Hoc Committee for the Improvement of Teacher Education. Large universities and small colleges scrambled to comply.

Funding for Clinical Supervision

In the spring of 1988, in the midst of the flurry created by the push to restructure teacher education programs across the state, the State Council of Higher Education solicited proposals for state-funded grants to support a few two-year projects in clinical supervision. The funding was to provide $500 stipends each of the two years for public school teachers who would be "trained" in supervision and then would work with student teachers in the clinical setting.

As the preeminent teacher preparatory institution in the state, Allegheny State moved to respond with a grant proposal. Because the guidelines suggested that cooperation between public and private institutions would be received favorably, officials at Allegheny State invited members of the Highlands Education Department to join them in writing the proposal.
The Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project was one of only four such proposals to be funded. From the outset, it was collaborative in nature. The other three state-funded projects were to follow more traditional approaches to training the cooperating teachers in clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969).

In the Allegheny State/Highlands Project, we were genuinely interested in mutual, interactive learning about the student teaching experience, but our approach was not without direction. We did have an agenda.

Research on teaching has long shown that novice teachers are more likely to teach the way they were taught throughout their schooling rather than the way they were taught to teach (Lortie, 1975). Teacher educators have struggled to break this vicious cycle of pedagogical reproduction. One way to do so is to make sure that prospective teachers have good models in their teacher education programs in both on-campus (Meske, 1987) and clinical programs. Research on teaching also suggests that the most important influence on the beginning teacher is the cooperating teacher (Defino, 1982; Brand, 1985). Only veteran teachers who were recommended by the building principal and by someone in higher education who had worked with them were to be selected for participation.
We believed in the value of self-evaluation in educational change (Kemmis, 1987). We began by asking these veteran teachers, most of whom had worked with many student teachers, to become critically aware of their own teaching. We wanted them to become verbal about their appraisals of their teaching so that they might later model that reflection on their practice with their student teachers (Ross & Hannay, 1986). We believed that, if the cooperating teacher modeled such reflection, the student teacher would be more likely to develop abilities to integrate theory and practice in his or her own teaching.

Thus, the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project was aimed at the improvement of student teaching, at the recognition and rewarding of the expertise of veteran teachers, and at developing linkages between higher education and the public schools.

The Need for the Study

Everson (1984) suggests the inadequacy of existing research on the preparation of student teachers in describing it as being "methodologically and theoretically anemic" (p.2). In his review of research on student teaching, Griffin (1981) notes that there is general agreement that training and skills are needed by cooperating
teachers, but there is a lack of agreement of the type of training indicated. He goes on to call for research on the selection and training of cooperating teachers. Lanier (1986) indicates the need for descriptive-analytic studies of the teacher education curriculum and the thinking and learning of teacher candidates.

This study, then, offers a comprehensive description of this collaborative inservice project in clinical supervision as it was carried out by faculty members from two institutions of higher education working along side classroom teachers from the public schools for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of the student teaching experience.

The researcher recorded the "immediate and local meanings of actions" (Erickson, 1986, p. 119) as defined from the points of view of four Project teachers at one secondary school, in an attempt to come to understand (1) their views of teaching and learning, (2) their views of the student teaching experience, and (3) how their participation in the first year of the project informed their work as teachers and their work as teacher educators. This study also led to the identification of aspects of this project that warrant further examination (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).
Overview of the Study

Chapter 1 has presented a brief overview of the historical and political context of the problems that were addressed by the project which is the focus of this study. It has also characterized the study as an exploratory study rather than as an attempt to support definitive statements.

Chapter 2 contains a review of literature related to various aspects of the study.

Chapter 3 offers a more complete description of the first year of the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project, including initial objectives, membership, and implementation activities.

Chapter 4 frames the research problem, beginning with a listing of the research questions. Then attention is given to describing the data collection and analysis methods used.

Chapter 5 includes research findings in the form of four cases which present excerpts from interview transcripts corroborated by other data sources. General description and interpretive commentary surround the evidence (Erickson, 1986).

Finally, Chapter 6 presents a discussion of the findings and their implications for further research on collaborative approaches to inservice education as well as the design of inservice projects for teachers.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

To increase my understanding of the research context into which this study of a collaborative model for inservice education in clinical supervision is set, I chose to review literature in the following areas:

(1) concerns raised about the traditional role of the cooperating teacher in the student teaching experience;

(2) teachers as a cultural group;

(3) emerging attempts to bridge the gap between colleges and universities and the public schools, including early approaches to improving student teaching through clinical supervision and support for teacher-centered inservice education; and

(4) identity salience theory from social psychology.

The Traditional Role of the Cooperating Teacher
Traditionally, the student teaching triad has consisted of a student teacher, a university or college supervisor (hereafter called the university supervisor), and the school-based supervising teacher (hereafter called the cooperating teacher).
The Importance of the Cooperating Teacher

There is widespread consensus that, of the two professionals working with the student teacher, the cooperating teacher has the greatest and most lasting influence. Tabachnick (1980) found that the student teacher's attitudes more closely approximated those of the cooperating teacher by the end of the student teaching placement than they did before student teaching began. Haberman (1978) found that student teachers are particularly susceptible to control by group norms, and especially to cooperating teachers as the normative group.

In a comprehensive study of student teaching conducted at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas, Austin, Defino and others (1982) learned that both student teachers and university supervisors consider the cooperating teacher to be their supporter and confidant, especially in problem situations. Both groups see the cooperating teacher as knowledgeable, available, and approachable. Although student teachers' perceptions of their cooperating teachers are generally positive, problems with their selection and with the lack of a common knowledge base on teaching and learning have been identified.
Selection

The above studies suggest that both the selection criteria for cooperating teachers and their preparation for working with novices are crucial. Griffin, the lead researcher in that same comprehensive study (1981), notes, however, that there is widespread imprecision and dissatisfaction over selection of cooperating teachers and supervisors. He cites a need for research done on operational standards for selection of cooperating teachers which can be evaluated against student teaching outcomes.

Lack of Knowledge Base

Although the university supervisor and cooperating teacher may be adequate personally, Griffin (1983) learned that neither is able to help the student teacher understand his or her teaching performance in meaningful ways. He found that the student teacher is exposed to situation-specific strategies, not to options from which to select. A further problem in student teaching identified by Griffin is that all participants in the triad lack awareness of policies, expectations, purposes, as well as knowledge of desirable practices.
One of the problems in the student teaching experience identified by O'Neal (1983) is that cooperating teachers tend to dominate conferences with student teachers. She found a ratio of cooperating teacher talk to student teacher talk to be 72% to 28%. The type of talk of the cooperating teachers tended to be "review" (37%) and "directions" (21%) with only 3% described as "acknowledgement" or "endorsement" of the student teacher. On the other hand, the student teachers' talk tended toward "classroom events" (32%) and "acknowledgement" or "endorsement" of the cooperating teacher (24%), with almost no "evaluation" (p. 7-10). O'Neal also noted that neither cooperating teachers nor student teachers paid much attention to evaluation of lesson objectives. The talk, rather, focused on methods and materials for use in the immediate context. (Cf. Griffin's "situation-specific strategies" as noted above.)

When Defino (1982) asked cooperating teachers to describe their student teachers' best strengths and greatest weaknesses, they tended to respond with personality characteristics rather than teaching behaviors or skills. Similarly, Kleinsasser (1988) found that the two dominant themes in the interaction between cooperating teachers and their student teachers were positive interpersonal relationships and the development of a unique teaching
style. It seems that "style" was a catch-all rationale for their differences in approach to teaching identified by the cooperating teachers and student teachers.

An earlier study (Hoy & Rees, 1977) identified classroom management as the center of field experience. Joyce and Clift (1984) characterize student teaching as socializing teachers toward practical attitudes and survival concerns.

The above studies lend additional support to the following conclusions drawn by O'Neal (1983, p.35):

1. There is a common, but largely untested, assumption that student teaching helps prepare the beginning teacher.
2. Personal qualities of the student teacher are often evaluated.
3. A satisfactory evaluation at the end of student teaching does not necessarily mean that the student teacher "grew" in the experience.
4. There is no evidence of an articulated knowledge base in student teaching.
5. Craft knowledge and "common sense" are the basis of decisions.
6. There is a lack of conceptual continuity regarding student teaching outcomes.
Cooperating teachers themselves are not oblivious to concerns about their role in the student teaching experience. Kelly & Kelly (1983) note that, although most cooperating teachers do not read the handbook provided for them, they indicate a felt need for guidance in their roles and are interested in inservice training. They also note that they are uncomfortable with the dual role of facilitator and evaluator.

Despite their uncertainties about working with student teachers, cooperating teachers have not tended to seek out other cooperating teachers for help with their concerns (Defino, 1982). An indication of why they have not done so may be found in looking at literature related to teachers as a cultural group.

The Culture of Teachers

During the past two decades, researchers interested in understanding complex educational phenomena have turned increasingly to anthropologists for assistance. Phillip Jackson (1968) predicted such a development over twenty years ago. Researchers on the culture of teachers indicate the importance of exploring the subjective world of teachers from their own view (Lortie, 1975) and of observing not only teachers' overt behaviors (Jackson, 1968), but also of
attending to the meanings individual teachers give to their own behavior and to that of others (Wolcott, 1977).

The wide diversity of individuals who enter the teaching field precludes the description of a definitive cultural group (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975). There are, however, four major areas within which commonalities have been identified. Those areas are (1) the themes that emerge when teachers talk; (2) the characteristics of teachers' relationships with other teachers; (3) the nature of teacher knowledge; and (4) teachers' views about educational change.

The Four Areas of Commonality

The Themes of Teacher Talk

One theme that emerges is immediacy. Teachers talk about the present, the here-and-now (Jackson, 1968; O'Neal, 1983). Unlike administrators and instructional supervisors who tend to be oriented toward the future, for teachers, it is the present that is most important. They face hundreds of decisions to be made each day -- mostly in the here-and-now (Bird & Little, 1986; Lortie, 1975.) Teachers want to be prepared for class, but resist being forced to do long-range planning (Wolcott, 1977).
A second theme of teacher talk is individuality. The successes of individual students appear to be of more interest to teachers than the progress of the group (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975). The development of interpersonal bonds with individual students is a key factor in the intrinsic rewards of teachers (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975).

A third theme that comes up when teachers talk is their need for a sense of autonomy. Teachers resist the external imposition of a fixed curriculum (Jackson, 1968). They also do not like to have administrators enter the classroom for the purpose of evaluation (Jackson, 1968; McPherson, 1972). If teachers can't have the opportunity to choose between options, they would prefer to be left alone (Wolcott, 1977). Because they value their own autonomy so highly, teachers tend to protect it through a tacit agreement to respect the autonomy of other teachers (McPherson, 1972).

Teachers' Relationships with Other Teachers

In the findings on the culture of teachers, the point is made repeatedly that most teachers operate in relative isolation from their co-workers. This phenomenon supports McPherson's point about protecting one's own autonomy. Teachers tend to see the individual classroom as the
teacher's own business. Thus, new teachers tend to view experienced co-worker as unreceptive (McPherson, 1972). The ideal teacher colleague, then, is one who is willing to help but who is not too pushy. For many teachers, to ask for help from someone down the hall or next door is to admit one's own failure (Lortie, 1975).

In addition to this isolation from co-workers, there is among teachers a relatively little hierarchical structuring compared to other occupations. New teachers are differentiated from experienced teachers (McPherson, 1972; Wolcott, 1977) and department chairpersons often have supervisory responsibilities. In some schools, however, even that role is rotated among the more experienced department members, leaving almost no hierarchy among teachers. Where seniority does play a role is in the assignment of class size. Senior teachers often are allowed to keep the same grade level and classroom when someone must be shifted. Sometimes experienced teachers have more choice of which students they will teach (McPherson, 1972). As was noted earlier, recent reform reports have called for recognition and reward of teaching excellence. In addition to merit pay plans and career ladder proposals, some divisions have moved toward recognizing lead-teachers who are considered to have special expertise and who are given
increased responsibilities (Marks, 1983; Houston & Felder, 1982).

**Teacher Knowledge**

Jackson (1968) characterizes teachers' knowledge as conceptually simple and without any technical vocabulary. He finds that teachers make decisions intuitively and that they have strong, inflexible opinions on instructional matters. He also states that most teachers have simple meanings for abstract terms such as motivation, and that those meanings are derived from their personal experiences and perspectives.

More recently, Shulman (1987) has made progress in describing categories of teacher knowledge. Schön (1983) has concluded that teaching is largely guided by tacit knowledge that is based on experience. Stake (1987, p.67), who labels such knowledge "naturalistic generalizations," has gone on to suggest that such knowledge is very personal to the individual. Teachers' lack of a "technical culture" -- a common set of practices and pedagogical values, methods, etc. -- leaves them without any knowledge base to pass on to neophytes (Lortie, 1975; O'Neal, 1983). Thus, instead of a sharing of ideas about curricular matters and instructional methods, teachers' room talk centers around
"politics, gripes, home life, personalities, and backgrounds of students" (McPherson, 1972).

Teachers' Views on Educational Change

Most teachers have had little interest in broad, dramatic educational reform and have viewed the contributions of learning theorists, educational psychologists, supervisors, and other specialists as not being of much help in their work (Jackson, 1968). Rather than being interested in new ways brought into their schools by newcomers, teachers often have feared that the methods might be more effective than their own. They have reacted by attempting indirectly to train the newcomer. When faced with their own shortcomings, they have coped by identifying scapegoats or turning to ritualism rather than by seeking innovations (McPherson, 1972).

From this review of some of the findings about the culture of teachers, a pattern emerges that suggests why classroom teachers have not, historically, been very much involved in the process of educational change. Teachers have been concerned about their autonomy -- their freedom to make decisions about individuals who are in their classrooms at the present time. They have had few opportunities for and little interest in sharing expertise with other
teachers, and have lacked a common knowledge base with which
to do so. Thus, rather than pushing for educational change,
it has traditionally been the classroom teacher who has
pushed against it.

**Implications for Student Teaching**

Ideally, classroom teachers who would be selected and
who would agree to work with student teachers would be a cut
above the mainstream. As noted above, however, there is
imprecision and dissatisfaction in the selection process in
many programs (Griffin, 1981). In creating a sense of the
cultural milieu into which the student teacher arrives, the
above review helps to show why some of the concerns about
the traditional role of the cooperating teacher have been
raised.

Cooperating teachers who are concerned about the here-
and-now would be more likely to encourage situation-specific
strategies (Griffin, 1983) rather than helping the student
teacher conceptualize a variety of options -- options that
could be needed in a future context and situation.
Cooperating teachers who have already successfully created
bonds with individual students could have difficulty with
issues of ownership of the classroom (Kleinsasser, 1988).
A concern for protecting their own autonomy in decisions about matters of instruction could affect cooperating teachers' talk with their student teachers. Many lack the desire to talk about instruction or the language with which to do so or both (Griffin, 1983; O'Neal, 1983). It would follow also that they would not be inclined to seek help of another cooperating teacher (Defino, 1982).

Although willing for a student teacher to try "new ideas" from university methods courses, they would not be likely to support those methods different from their own and might dismiss differences in approaches to teaching between themselves and their student teachers as differences in "style" (Kleinsasser, 1988).

Locating the cooperating teacher as a subset within the larger cultural group of teachers is a way of coming to understand belief systems and shared meaning that might affect the work of the actors in the student teaching triad. Though no claim is made for causal relationships, making these possible connections explicit is a way of moving to a discussion of the emerging attempts to deal with some of these concerns through alternative approaches to inservice education.
Emerging Alternative Approaches to Inservice Teacher Education

What has been done to address the problems that have long existed in the traditional approaches to teacher education?

Clinical Supervision

In 1962, Robert Bush of Stanford University set forth the concept of the school-based clinical professorship (Kaslov, 1976). The idea received widespread attention when James B. Conant included in The Education of American Teachers (1963) recommendations for the establishment of clinical professorships as part of teacher education programs. Building on Bush's idea, Conant advocated that a skilled classroom teacher be employed by the university to work in public school settings with groups of teacher trainees. Other variations had the clinical professor working with a few cooperating teachers and several student teachers (Dale & Kline, 1975).

Ten years after the publication of that Conant report, Kaslov (1976) notes that a nationwide survey of teacher preparatory institutions showed little agreement on just what a clinical professorship should look like and whether, in fact, such a concept was being implemented. Though the clinical professorship was little accepted and rarely
implemented, it seems that it kept reappearing with a new label from time to time during the later 1960s and early 1970s.

Although widespread acceptance of a clinical program model never developed, one approach to student teacher supervision has been adopted or adapted by most teacher education programs. The model (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969) focuses on four aspects of the interaction between student teacher and supervising teacher: talk about planning, non-valuative observation of teaching, careful analysis of written notes on classroom interaction, and giving selected feedback to the teacher who was observed.

The model emphasizes a collegial rather than a superordinate to subordinate relationship in which the teacher being observed identifies what is to be the focus of the observation. The four steps in the model that has come to be synonymous with the term "clinical supervision" are (1) the pre-observation conference; (2) the observation; (3) analysis and preparation of a report by the observer; and (4) the post-observation conference.

In the decades of the 1970s and 1980s, many university supervisors used the Cogan/Goldhammer model themselves, and some university faculty members attempted to train their cooperating teachers in these four steps of clinical
supervision -- all with varying degrees of success. Why has the training of cooperating teachers not solved the problems of student teaching? One response to that question can be inferred from the above discussion of the culture of teachers. As a subset of that larger group, cooperating teachers are also quite likely to be resistant to externally imposed change.

In addition, Davidman (1985) cites the incongruencies between the model and the realities of the clinical setting as the reason this approach to supervision is unworkable. He notes that the relationship between the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor and the student teacher is not and can never be truly collegial. In their respective roles supervisors (and cooperating teachers) do have to evaluate the student teacher. He notes that neither the student teacher, nor the cooperating teacher, nor the supervisor own the student teaching experience, but rather ownership rests with the program itself. Finally, he points to the student teaching context itself as being problematic: (1) it has low financial support and status in the university, and (2) the pupils' growth, not that of the student teacher must remain the main concern of the cooperating teacher.
In light of these problems of incongruence, Davidman recommends, "... a new program that will avoid borrowed terms such as clinical, in favor of words such as collaborative, developmental, unified, systematic, or supportive -- terms that more accurately describe what should be occurring in teacher education programs" (p.99).

Interest in changing the roles of the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher is widespread. The belief is emerging that the job of the university supervisor should be to work directly with the cooperating teacher and that the cooperating teacher, who has daily contact with the student teacher, should have primary responsibility for facilitating the growth of the novice (Horton & Harvey, 1979; Emans, 1983).

In teacher education research findings, we have seen ample evidence of a wide communication gap between university colleges of education and the public schools (Defino, 1982; Kelly & Kelly, 1983; Brand, 1985, and others). In his comprehensive study of student teaching, Griffin (1983) found little integration between on-campus course work and the student teaching situation and few policy, practice, or personal links between the university and the public schools. Evertson (1984) has called for specific integration of classroom and practice experiences
to allow opportunity to test knowledge learned in courses. She has also cited the need for training of cooperating teachers in strategies being taught in teacher education programs.

If the influence of the cooperating teacher is critical to the development of the beginning teacher; if there is a lack of articulation and communication between institutional levels; if there is a lack of a knowledge base on teacher education, and if teachers resist top-down models of inservice training, then it would seem to be appropriate to create inservice education opportunities in which teachers from various levels would work together to build a common knowledge base about the student teaching experience.

A Paradigm Shift: Self-Evaluation in Teacher Education

Gibbons and Norman (1987) have noted that the current paradigm shift from teacher-centered to student-centered classrooms and curriculum in schools can and ought to be accompanied by a similar paradigm shift in teacher preparation. Blau (1988) suggests that such a paradigm shift is already under way in inservice education for teachers. She credits the success of the National Writing Project with having influenced a shift from top-down attempts at staff
development toward more egalitarian and pragmatic models. Empirical evidence is currently being gathered to substantiate a linkage between the Writing Project summer institutes and both of the above-mentioned paradigm shifts.

One of the underlying principles of the National Writing Project is that teachers will examine their own writing processes in the summer institutes. Increasingly, there is agreement that the basis for educational innovation and improvement lies in self-evaluation (Kemmis, 1987). Wideen (p.5) suggests that "teachers must be at the center" and that "collaboration, collegiality, and mutual adaptation are necessary ingredients in any school improvement plan." Similarly, Griffin (1987, p. 34-35) lists "participation and collaboration" as well as "reflective and analytical" as elements and/or characteristics of any successful staff development program.

The implication, then, is that both experienced and novice teachers can improve their teaching through evaluating their own work in the classroom. Teacher educators are beginning to see the value of fostering cooperative self-evaluation in the clinical setting. Rudduck (1987) offers the concept of "partnership supervision" and calls for the instilling of the habit of curiosity in student teachers and providing experienced
classroom teachers the continued opportunity to learn.

Fieman-Nemser and Buchmann (1986) characterize effective teacher education as occurring only when student teachers have learned to question what they see, what they believe, and what they do. They want novices to see student teaching as a beginning -- not as a culminating experience. A critical question that Ginsberg (1985, p. 102) suggests is "Do student teachers see curriculum knowledge as given or as problematical?"

Since it has been demonstrated that student teachers take on the attitudes of their cooperating teachers during their student teaching (Tobachnick, 1980; Haberman, 1978), it would seem that, if the cooperating teacher modeled being what Cruikshank (1985) calls a "reflective teacher," the student teacher would be more likely to develop that habit of curiosity.

Similarly, Schön (1983) uses the term "reflective practitioner" to indicate a teacher who identifies and solves problems, an action researcher who thinks and does in the course of his or her practice. This linkage of thought and action is called "praxis" by Kemmis (1987, p. 75-76), who suggests that the actor "mediates between past personal history and social history and the future [he or she] begins to make through present action. "Praxis" then, is
"informed, committed action."

**The Value of Critical Reflection**

Stake suggests (1987) that the best way to move toward planned change is to rely on the experiences and intuitions of practitioners. Ross and Hanney (1986) conclude that when an individual examines his or her personal theories of action against more general theories of teaching and learning, the result is the forming of more closely held beliefs about teaching and learning.

Theis-Sprinthall and Sprinthall (1987) have demonstrated compelling evidence of the value of teachers engaging in critical self-evaluation. Despite early psychological beliefs that the human brain does not develop after adolescence, they found that the teachers participating in a mentor program experienced psychological growth during the project. In addition to being more self-confident as learners, they increased in perspective-taking ability and in ability to abstract meaning from experience.

These findings corroborated an earlier study by Sprinthall (1980) in which the levels of cognitive development of student teachers and those of cooperating teachers were tested. The dyads were then intentionally matched or mismatched resulting in four combinations of ST-
high/CT-high; ST-high/CT-low; ST-low/CT-high; and ST-low/CT-low. The ST-high/CT-low group was the only group to have problems. Cooperating teachers with less complex cognitive structures than their student teachers were unable to perceive the performance of their student teachers accurately. The findings indicate that perhaps some prior screening and matching of student teachers to cooperating teachers is desirable (Wilson, 1984). (See also Hughes, 1982; Hukill, 1983.)

In addition to the difficulty with the mismatched pairs, in that same study Sprinthall (1980) also found that the cooperating teachers as a group were found to have slight increases in cognitive development. Blau (1988) suggests evidence of similar development of cognitive structures in National Writing Project Institute fellows in tracing their movement through three stages: (1) the simple relaying of accounts of their teaching experiences; (2) the offering of inservice presentations for other teachers; and (3) becoming teacher researchers in their own classrooms.

One way that critical reflection or critical discourse has found its way into the reality of experienced teachers has been through the movement toward teacher research. Two of the arguments for teacher research (Hopkins, 1987) are that it gives teachers a sense of self-worth through the
making of decisions and that traditional educational research seldom reaches the classroom teacher in a way that results in any meaningful action. Hopkins also notes that the consequences of teacher research have been that (1) teachers become more concerned about the impact of their teaching on their students and (2) the classroom climate becomes more supportive, more democratic.

In his call for involving teachers in action research, Day (1987) points to teachers' need for ownership of their learning as an explanation for their tendency to resist top-down change efforts. He notes that teachers need to feel a personal investment in both process and outcomes of whatever it is that they are to undertake and that without such investment the innovation will never be adopted or utilized. In addition to ownership, he lists affiliation, achievement, being appreciated, and self-efficacy as needs that teachers share.

Identity Salience

The topic of identity salience from role theory in social psychology is also relevant to this study. Stryker (1981) suggests that "identities are conceptualized as being organized into a hierarchy of salience defined by the probability of the various identities being invoked in a
given situation or over many situations" (p.24). Where a particular role is located in the hierarchy is related to the individual's level of commitment to that role.

If "commitment" is "the degree to which an individual's relationships to specified sets of other persons depends on his or her being a particular kind of person" (Stryker, p.24), then one is committed to a particular role to the degree that one's relationships with others require that role. A teacher's sense of herself as a teacher of the students in her classroom is, no doubt, very important to her. At the same time, her sense of herself as someone who facilitates the development of student teachers could be much lower in salience.

It would follow, then, that increasing the extent and intensiveness of relationships that require the teacher to be in the role of teacher educator increases the commitment to that role, and thus, the salience of that identity in her hierarchy of social roles.

**Summary**

The research indicates that there are problems in the traditional approach to student teaching. There is a lack of appropriate communication between actors in the student teaching triad as well as between the institutions involved.
Though there is a growing knowledge base about effective teaching, that knowledge is neither apprehended by cooperating teachers nor transmitted to student teachers.

Earlier attempts at clinical supervision did not take into account and build upon the experienced teacher's expertise, and in the past, cooperating teachers received little or no recognition or reward for their contributions. Now, however, the concept of the master teacher -- with increased status, pay, and responsibility -- appears in nearly every call for educational change. In addition to the increased responsibility and higher status, master teachers focusing on their work with student teachers are likely to experience an increase in the salience of their identity as teacher educators.

Every indication is in place for change -- for the type of change called for several years ago by teacher education researchers Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Margaret Buchmann (1983, p.18): "... changes that would enable teachers to study their practice together and get rewards for doing so. If schools became places where teachers as well as pupils learned, then future teachers would learn to teach in classrooms where their cooperating teachers were also students of teaching." In the form of an interactive, collaborative inservice project in clinical supervision,
Allegheny State University and nearby Highlands College responded to that call for change in the 1988-1990 biennium.
CHAPTER 3

A DESCRIPTION OF THE
ALLEGHENY STATE/HIGHLANDS COLLEGE CLINICAL FACULTY PROJECT

The Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project was one of four such Projects funded by this state during the 1988-1990 biennium. The original Project objectives were

(1) To effect closer and better collaboration for the preparation of teachers
   a. across the areas of elementary, secondary, vocational-technical, and physical education; and
   b. between school divisions and colleges and universities.

(2) To develop an effective training program for clinical faculty that represents a shift of responsibility from the college or university to the teachers and the school division.

(3) To engage clinical faculty in action research focused on the student teaching process that
   a. serves as a catalyst for thinking about teaching; and
   b. provides important insights about the student teaching experience.
(4) To develop an electronic communications network that allows for and encourages communication among student teachers, clinical faculty, and college and university professors.

The 47 public school teachers who participated in the Project met approximately twice per month from October to May of the 1988-1989 school year. For their time and energy, they received a $500 stipend and the opportunity to register for graduate credit in clinical supervision at either Allegheny State or Highlands. They, in turn, agreed to accept the placement of a student teacher from Allegheny State or Highlands when asked to do so.

The following is a description of the first year of the Project.

Membership

Participants

Public school teachers from four area school divisions participated in the Project. They included elementary (18), secondary (18), vocational-technical (5), and physical education (6) teachers, representing a wide range of grade and/or subject areas. Included in the secondary group were teachers of English (5), foreign language (2), math (4), music (1), science (4), and social studies (2). The five
vocational-technical teachers included teachers of agriculture, business, home economics, marketing, and technology.

The seven faculty members from Allegheny State (5) and Highlands(2) who participated in the formulating of the Project proposal continued to serve as the Clinical Faculty Steering Committee, assuming responsibility for planning and leading the various sessions. Allegheny State faculty subject area specialists and graduate assistant supervisors of student teachers became involved in the secondary section sessions from January to May.

An Advisory Committee, comprised of members of the Project Steering Committee and a representative from each of the school divisions and each of the institutions of higher education met twice during the first year for the purposes of keeping all parties informed of the activities of the Project and of obtaining input from administrators of the collaborating institutions.

Selection

Selection of participants in the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project was a joint process involving representatives from each participating school division and institution of higher education.
Selection criteria included:

(1) possess a valid state Collegiate Professional Certificate
(2) be certified to the assigned subjects and/or grade levels
(3) preferably have a masters degree
(4) preferably have had experience supervising an intern or student teacher
(5) have been a successful classroom teacher for a minimum of three years.

Prospective participants for the elementary section of the Project were identified by the building principal and then approved by Allegheny State and/or Highlands faculty members who had worked with them in the past. In the secondary section of the Project, Allegheny State subject area specialists and the Highlands secondary faculty member identified prospective participants who were then approved by the building principals. This procedure was used because spring semester placements in secondary teaching at Allegheny State had already been made. A similar process was used for selection of teachers for the physical education section of the Project. In each case, the teachers were then invited to apply. Applicants were, thus, pre-approved, and additional applicants were invited until
the number of slots allotted to each section was filled.

The relatively closed procedure used in the elementary, secondary, and physical education sections of the Project was necessary due to the limited amount of time available to select the people and still begin the sessions by the end of October. The low profile approach also served to minimize intra-school political problems for the principals and for the teachers selected.

In the vocational-technical education (VTE) section of the Project, a somewhat more open process was used. Vocational-technical teachers approved by their building principals were given applications. Allegheny State Vocational-Technical Division faculty then selected participants from among those who had applied. The more open procedure used by the VTE section required additional time and appeared to result in some communication problems as to who was and who was not to be involved in the Clinical Faculty Project.

In that both Highlands and Allegheny State would be seeking to place student teachers with cooperating teachers who were not selected for the Clinical Faculty Project, Steering Committee and Advisory Committee members were sensitive to the reality that teachers receiving $500 stipends would be working side-by-side with teachers who
were receiving $60 or $75. This problem seemed to take care of itself once the non-Clinical Faculty cooperating teachers realized the time commitment required of the Clinical Faculty members.

Implementation

Schedule, Shape of First Year

The first year of the Project consisted of two phases. In Phase I (October-December, 1988), the Clinical Faculty members met at Highlands with faculty from Allegheny State and Highlands (the Project Steering Committee) in mixed grade level and subject area groups, focusing first on analyzing their own teaching and then discussing how their new insights could inform their work with student teachers. For Phase II (January-April, 1989), participants were divided into the four Project sections -- Elementary, secondary, Physical Education, and Vocational-Technical Education -- with each section setting its own schedule and topics for discussion. During Phase II, a student teacher was placed with each Clinical Faculty member. In the final session held at Highlands in May, the participants returned to their original mixed groups. (See Appendix -- Timetable.)
Phase I Tasks

In the initial after-school session on October 26, participants were asked to do a concept-building task in which they constructed lists of qualities one might have who worked well with student teachers. The task was designed to build trust and group membership quickly and to minimize risk.

In the only all-day session of the Project on October 29, the groups performed three tasks. These tasks were designed to develop awareness of the perspective of the student teacher, of the complexity of classroom life, and of the difference between making observations and making judgments about teaching.

In the other three after-school Phase I sessions, the Clinical Faculty members were asked to begin systematic observation in their own classrooms by doing brief case studies of two of their students and then of themselves as teachers. (See Appendix -- Description of Phase I Tasks.)

Thus, in Phase I, the focus was on elements of teaching common to all teachers. Having the opportunity to share ideas, perspectives, and concerns with teachers of other subjects and/or other grade levels was an aspect of the Project that was clearly very important to the participants. Many of them indicated their interest and/or surprise that
they had so much in common. (See Appendix -- Final Session Responses.) In Phase II, the configuration of the groupings was to allow for the differences between levels and/or subjects.

Phase II

As at any major university, the programs having responsibility for the preparation of teachers at Allegheny State are quite varied and diverse. Highlands is a small liberal arts college with an Education Department that serves a limited number of prospective elementary and secondary teachers. The arrival of second semester student teachers in the schools called for increased attention to specific policies of the two institutions of higher education and of the faculty members in the various subject areas and levels. The varying needs, intentions, expectations, policies, and concerns of the two institutions and of the four areas were provided for in Phase II. Thus, the Phase II activities of the four sections of the Project will be described separately.
Elementary

From January to April the elementary Clinical Faculty members, led by the Elementary Program Area Leader at Allegheny State and the Elementary Education Specialist at Highlands, met in seven two-hour after-school sessions at the various schools of the participating teachers. The focus in the elementary section was on the role of the cooperating teacher and attempting to describe how that role changes over time. In Phase II the following questions shaped the discussion for the elementary section of the Project:

1. What do the first two to three weeks look like?
2. What are ways the student teachers can become acquainted with the children quickly?
3. What are some appropriate initial teaching tasks?
4. How can we help the student teachers develop their abilities to think about their own teaching? What strategies have you used in the past to do this? What ideas for improvement on those strategies do you have?
5. How can 'peer coaching' techniques be helpful in working with the student teacher?

The participants analyzed their work with their student
teachers by coming back again and again to the question 'What are we doing?'

Secondary

Led by the Secondary Program Area Leader at Allegheny State and the researcher, who is the Secondary Education Specialist at Highlands, the eighteen secondary Clinical Faculty members met as a larger group twice in January. Then for one of the two sessions each in February, March, and April, they further subdivided by subject area and met separately with various Allegheny State subject area specialists and Graduate Assistant supervisors of student teachers. The alternating small and larger secondary sessions came to be opportunities for the Clinical Faculty members and personnel from the college or university to discuss subject-specific and/or institution-specific issues related to real student teachers in addition to matters of more general concern. (See Appendix --Timetable.)

In Phase II the following questions shaped the discussions in the secondary section of the Project:

(1) What do you remember about your own student teaching or about your work with student teachers in the past? What implications do those memories have for us in our efforts to make the student
teaching experience better?

(2) What strategies have you used or are you planning to use to orient your student teacher to the school and classroom communities?

(3) What strategies or ideas do you have for helping the student teacher learn classroom management techniques?

(4) What is the student teacher able to do with ease at this point? (4 weeks) With what tasks of teaching is he she still struggling?

(5) What should he/she be able to do at the mid-point? What tasks do you anticipate will still pose a problem?

(6) What should be the level of performance of a student teacher at the end of his/her clinical experience? Are there certain kinds of problems that tend to persist even into the first year of teaching?

(7) How does the role of the cooperating teacher in the school (and that of the college supervisor) change over time in response to growth of the student teacher?

In one of the large secondary sessions, participants looked at examples of their written feedback to their
student teacher to see how it had changed over time. Volunteers shared ways of giving non-direct written feedback, including interaction analysis, scripting, and question-type analysis.

Physical Education

Two elementary and four secondary teachers participated in the physical education section of the Project, led by a professor in physical education at Allegheny State. Based on 'teacher effectiveness' research, the objective in the physical education section was the development of specific teaching skills (e.g. maximum time on task) through the use of systematic observation instruments.

Because the two elementary physical education teachers in this Project had already been involved in a Clinical Teacher project designed by physical education professors at Allegheny State, they were somewhat 'ahead' of the others in their ability to use the instruments. Thus, they were able to give assistance to the secondary teachers from time to time. Another goal was to continue the development and revision of a clinical teacher handbook for use with physical education student teachers. (See Appendix -- Timetable.)
Vocational-Technical Education

The five VTE teachers, led by a vocational education professor at Allegheny State, met four times during January and February. Their activities and discussions were intended to help them come to think of themselves as teacher educators. While viewing a video tape of an agricultural economics student teacher, they worked on observation and note-making techniques and on increasing their understanding of the state competencies-based assessment program for first year teachers. They used role playing of conferences between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and/or supervisor to come to a better understanding of the different perspectives of the members of the student teaching triad. Their discussions also included the topics of formative and summative evaluation and the writing of recommendations. (See Appendix -- Timetable.)

Final Session -- Year One

On May 24, 1989, the final session of the first year of the Project was held at Highlands. Meeting in their original mixed subject/grade level groups, participants responded to in writing and then discussed the following questions:
(1) What words or phrases might you use to describe a Clinical Faculty member who works successfully with student teachers?

(2) What did you find most interesting and/or surprising in your work with the Project this year?

(3) What are your needs for next year as a Clinical Faculty member?

(4) How can we extend the effect of the Project beyond next year?

The written responses were compiled in summary form and used in a two-day July planning session. (See Appendix -- Final Session Responses.) Fifteen of the 47 Clinical Faculty members volunteered to meet with members of the Project Steering Committee to assess needs and determine directions for the second year of the Project.

Summary

A great deal of progress toward fulfilling the first three original objectives of the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project (see Introduction) was made during the first year (1988-1989). During the second year work continued on the first three objectives, and the fourth objective was addressed in a grant proposal to IBM for the
The purpose of securing funding for such an electronic communications network.

In the initial discussions among the Steering Committee members who developed the grant proposal for this Project, there was agreement that the Allegheny State/Highlands approach to clinical supervision would be collaborative. The members of the Committee believed that the participating teachers would have a great deal of expertise in working with student teachers to share and that it would be desirable to form a partnership with them for learning about the student teaching experience together. The Committee also believed that input from the participating teachers should be used as formative evaluation, to guide and shape the Project along the way.

Consequently, during Phases I and again at the final session on May 24, the use of index cards (coded by group) allowed the facilitators somewhat systematically to collect such input from the participants. The Clinical Faculty members' responses to the various questions were compiled and shared with them at the following session so that they could know something of the thinking of the other groups.

Meeting approximately twice per month over seven months of the 1988-1989 academic year in various small and large group combinations, 47 public school teachers, 12 Allegheny
State and Highlands Faculty members, and 3 graduate assistants shared a unique opportunity. They had time to talk to each other, to learn from each other and with each other. They learned a great deal about their work with student teachers. More important, they began to learn how to learn about the student teaching experience.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Bogdan & Bilken (1982, p.30) define "theoretical perspective" as one's "way of looking at the world, like assumptions people have about what is important, and what makes the world work." Thus, it is not just that I used an interpretivistic rather than a positivistic theoretical perspective in my approach to the study of this inservice program in clinical supervision, but that I have an interpretivistic theoretical perspective. It is my way of looking at the world, a part of who I am.

Erickson (1984, p.129) describes the task of the interpretive researcher in education as being "to discover specific ways in which local and nonlocal forms of social organization and culture relate to the activities of specific persons in making choices and conducting social action together . . . to constitute. . . the learning environment."

In this study, I analyzed how cooperating teachers participating in this project

(1) made use of learned meaning acquired through acculturation;
(2) took account of actions of those outside the immediate scene;

(3) learned new culturally shared meanings through face-to-face encounters; and

(4) created meanings as they constituted the learning environment of the Project. (Erickson, 1984).

In this chapter I present (1) the focus and purpose of the study, including the research questions; (2) the roles of the researcher; (3) the context and participants; (4) the data collection procedures; (5) the data analysis procedures; and (6) the steps taken to provide credibility.

Focus and Purpose of the Study

The focus of this study was the first year of the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project, a two-year, state-funded project in which faculty from the two institutions of higher education worked collaboratively with teachers from the public schools in an attempt to gain a better understanding of the clinical aspect of teacher education.

The study had two purposes:

(1) To describe the interactive approach to clinical supervision as it was used in the first year of
this project so that it might be available as a model for others planning similar efforts; and
(2) To learn how participation in the Project sessions informed the work of the participants as teachers and as teacher educators.

A description of the first year of the Project was presented in Chapter Three. The findings from the four case studies of Project participants form one secondary school are presented in Chapter Five and discussed in Chapter Six.

The Roles of the Researcher

Explaining the interconnectedness of the various roles that I have assumed in my work with the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project may be the most difficult part of reporting this study.

Research Associate/Faculty Member

During the 1989-1990 biennium, I was a doctoral student at Allegheny State University and a two-thirds full-time instructor in the Education Department at Highlands College. It was, I suspect, because of that link that faculty members from Allegheny State initiated collaboration with the nearby private school. Prior to this venture, contacts between the two institutions had been quite limited.
When the grant was funded with approval for a one-fourth time research position, one of my major professors who is on the Project Steering Committee suggested that I be considered. I could provide a communication link between the two institutions, and I had research interests in such a "bottom-up" (Blau, 1988) approach to inservice education. In my role as faculty member in secondary education at Highlands, I served on the Steering Committee and was involved in leading many of the sessions, especially those involving secondary teachers.

As Project Research Associate, I had responsibility for logistics arrangements (meeting space, flip pads, easels, markers, handouts, and refreshments) for many of the various meetings. My primary responsibility, however, was the formative and summative evaluation of the Project. The former included taking and disseminating minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings and collecting information generated in the Project sessions and returning it -- with some synthesis, analysis and interpretation -- to Project members at the following session. Kemmis (1987) notes that such collection and dissemination of compelling data is essential to successful school-based action research projects. With regard to summative evaluation, I sent an interim report on the Project to the State Council of Higher
Education in July of 1989. A final report is to be submitted in July of 1990.

As a faculty member at Highlands, I was regarded as a colleague by the other members of the Project Steering Committee. Although some role strain is an inevitable part of human experience (Goode, 1960), I probably experienced more than the norm during my work with the Project.

**Researcher**

In addition to the above, I was in the role of a qualitative researcher -- collecting work samples and responses to questions, conducting interviews, audio-taping project sessions, and observing in classrooms. Occasionally, I experienced role overload which is a form of role strain described by Goode (1960) as occurring when the set of total obligations is over-demanding.

Erickson (1984) suggests that most of us do not see the world around us in everyday life, that it is invisible to us because it is so familiar. Spradley (1980) cautions that the more you know about a context, the more difficult it is to study that context. This concern was particularly relevant in my research situation. I taught in secondary schools for seventeen years before becoming a supervisor of secondary student teachers. For me it is probably not
possible to make the familiar world of the high school strange as Erickson advocates. I can only attempt to account for the researcher effects of my familiarity with the world of high school and hope that awareness helps me create vivid descriptions in reporting the findings of the study.

The Research Questions

The following questions served as guidelines for the case study data collection and were used to shape the reports on the findings:

(1) How did these teachers come to be selected for participation in the Clinical Faculty Project?
   a. Who are they?
      -- Professional biography
      -- Previous experience with student teachers?
   b. What is their perception of how they were selected?

(2) How do selected teachers view themselves as teachers?
   a. What are their beliefs about the teaching/learning process?
   b. What do they see as their strengths as teachers?
c. What concerns do they have about their work as teachers?

d. How do they describe their classroom environments?

(3) How did the first year of the Clinical Faculty Project inform their work as teachers?
   a. What changes are they aware of in their teaching this year?
   b. How did the tasks of Phase I inform their teaching?
   c. How did the discussions of Phase II inform their teaching?

(4) How did the first year of the Clinical Faculty Project inform their work with student teachers?
   a. How did the tasks of Phase I inform their interaction with their student teachers?
   b. In what ways is their orientation of student teachers to the school and classroom community different from ways with previous student teachers?
   c. How did the discussions of Phase II inform their interaction with their student teacher?
   d. How has their sense of themselves as teacher educators changed?
Entering the Field

Determining Context and Participants

Although the first session of the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project was held in late October of 1988, I did not determine the school setting or select informants for my study until mid-January -- after the Project moved from Phase I into Phase II. During the five first semester sessions, I did, however, collect work samples from all of the participants as they worked in the mixed subject/grade level groups so that I would have some evidence of their early participation.

While working with Phase I of the Project as a Steering Committee member, I began to note individuals who might be willing to collaborate with me in a study of outcomes of the Project. I also laid a foundation for the trust (Erickson, 1986) that would eventually develop between the teachers who became my informants and myself.

Some of the teachers in the Project were the only representative selected from their schools. Others were one of two or three. Because the secondary education specialists at Allegheny State had placed student teachers with teachers there for the past few years, Sparta City High School had seven representatives in the Project, including
one each in Spanish, science, math, business, and marketing and two in English. As a graduate assistant supervisor of student teachers at Allegheny State, I had worked with the two English teachers in the past. From initial contacts, I sensed that all seven would probably be willing to be informants in my study.

By inviting the seven Project participants from Sparta High to become my research partners, I was able to include teachers from a variety of subject areas, including two who were participating in the Vocational-Technical section of the Project as described in Chapter 3. Focusing the study on one school made communications relating to the study and the scheduling of interviews much less of a problem. It also led me to conduct support interviews with the building principal and the division Director of Instruction, adding the perspectives of public school officials who supervise the seven teachers to my awareness of the research context.

**Explaining the Study**

I first made an appointment with the building principal to explain the study. I took an overview sheet that gave the purposes of the study and the tentative data collection schedule. I also asked him to sign one consent form as an informant and seven others as building principal. (See
Appendix -- Introduction to Research.) Although I was not dealing with the type of individuals who would pressure or feel pressured, I wanted the teachers to know that he supported my research.

That same afternoon, I had an appointment to meet with the seven teachers after school. I had told each briefly the week before that I wanted to explain my study and ask for their help as interview subjects. I gave each an overview sheet and a consent form. I made it clear that their involvement in the Project in no way required them to participate in my study.

Before I had finished going over the tentative schedule, two of the teachers began signing the consent form. The others followed quickly. I protested weakly that they should hear all of the details first. One said, "No, this is a good Project. Some of us have talked about it today, and we agree that we want to do what we can to help you let people know what we're doing." If I had not felt absolutely certain that all seven were genuinely interested in participating, I might have felt guilty for not thinking that it would, perhaps, have been more ethical to meet with them separately rather than to chance anyone's feeling pressured to participate. Their quick agreement to participate in the study also was an indication of their
high level of comfort in working with me.

About three weeks into their student teaching term, I explained my study to each of the student teachers who were placed with each of the seven teachers and secured their consent to use excerpts from their recorded talk with their cooperating teachers. (See Appendix -- Introduction to the Research.)

Selecting the Cases

From the early discussions among the Steering Committee members, I suspected that the experience of the two vocational teachers would be different from that of the others during the second phase of the Project. Until we got into Phase II, I did not realize the extent of that difference. I attended the VTE sessions as a participant/observer, ostensibly for Project evaluation purposes. The sessions were, for the most part, direct instruction, suggesting that the Allegheny State professor leading them has assumptions about teaching and learning that are different from the leaders of the elementary and secondary sections of the Project, differences that had only begun to be apparent in the early meetings and Phase I sessions.
Though I continued to interview and to collect other data from the two vocational teachers, I did not include them as cases in this study. Perhaps in a follow-up study, that data can be used to contrast their experience with that of others in the secondary section of the Project.

Because he took on responsibilities of coaching a spring sport, one of the English teachers was unable to attend any Project sessions after January. Coincidentally, the Allegheny State student teacher assigned to him dropped out of the program in early February. I also continued to interview that English teacher and to collect all other data related to him but did not include his case in the analysis because the data set for him is so far from complete.

After deciding not to analyze the data from the two vocational-technical teachers and the one English teacher, I was left with four informants for the study. They included one teacher each in Spanish, mathematics, earth science, and English.

**Additional Informants**

In addition to the seven teachers who became research partners with me in this study, I conducted interviews with selected other individuals related to the Project, including five officials at Allegheny State: the Dean of the College
of Education; the secondary science specialist; and three members on the Project Steering Committee, including the Secondary Program Area Leader, the Elementary Program Area Leader, and the above-mentioned VTE professor. I also interviewed two officials from Sparta City Schools: the building principal at Sparta High School and the Director of Instruction for the division. At the time of the first interview with each of them, I explained the study and secured their written consent. These interviews were transcribed and used to improve my general understanding of the Project and the context of the study, but they were not subjected to systematic analysis.

Data Collection

The Interviews

Spradley (1979) suggests that the best informants for ethnographic interviewing are those who have thorough enculturation and current involvement in the cultural group, and adequate time for interviewing. I believe my selection of informants and interview schedule allowed me to meet those criteria in this study. His other two criteria for good interviewing -- selection of an unfamiliar cultural scene and informants who are nonanalytic -- were precluded by my previous experience in secondary schools, as noted
above, and the tendency for very good teachers, administrators, and teacher educators to be analytic.

In a period of approximately 17 weeks during the spring semester of 1989, I conducted the two sets of interviews with the two groups of informants described above. I interviewed each of the seven Clinical Faculty members at Sparta High four times and each of the university and public school officials twice. Most of the interviews ran about 50 minutes to one hour in length. (See Appendix -- Introduction to Research, Overview.)

With the exception of two interviews with the science teacher, all of the interviews with the seven teachers were conducted in a conference room in the Sparta High School Guidance Department where we were free from interruption and distraction. The two exceptions were due to the reluctance of the science teacher to be very far from the classroom when her student teacher had the class alone. Those two interviews were conducted in a nearby teacher work room and were, predictably, interrupted many times.

The elements of a good interview (Spradley, 1979) include an explicit purpose, ethnographic explanations, and ethnographic questions. In each of the interviews, I began by clarifying the purpose of the interview and suggesting the overall topics I wanted to cover in that session. (See
Appendix -- Interview Guidelines.) I was careful to encourage the informants to use their own words, "the language you would use with a colleague" each time. I was mindful of the importance of "wait time" after each of the questions but sometimes rephrased questions that seemed unclear to the interviewee. When I sensed that some of the subjects became frustrated with my repeated, "Is there anything else...?" I told them that it was okay to say no.

Most of the interviews consisted of descriptive questions. (e.g. "Tell me about...") Occasionally I asked contrast questions. (e.g. "How is _____ different from _____?" (Spradley, 1979) I encouraged the interviewees to tell a story to illustrate or just to say whatever came to mind in response to my prompts rather than waiting for one question after another. Because of the multiple roles I played in my work with the Project, I encouraged the teachers to attempt to suspend their knowledge that I was involved in leading some of the sessions and to avoid telling me what they thought I wanted to hear. As I began to develop insights into what were eventually going to be assertions from my analysis, I was conscious to attempt to uncover disconfirming evidence (Erickson, 1986.)
Rather than predetermining questions for all of the interviews, I decided what general areas I needed to cover in each of the four rounds of interviews based on the conceptual framework I had developed in my research questions. Then, as I moved through the semester, I developed the more specific guidelines for the next interview based on my sense of the gains of the previous round and in response to the directions the Project sessions were taking along the way.

**The Participant/Observations**

**Classrooms**

Before the student teachers arrived at the schools, I asked for and received permission to do one 50-minute observation in the classroom of each of the teachers. The observation was not a part of the original overview of the research schedule I had presented to my informants, so I asked the permission of the principal and of each of the teachers separately. I also asked that each teacher request the students' permission for me to audio tape the classroom sessions. All were very agreeable.

Erickson (1986) calls the use of a tape recorder in gathering field notes "microethnography" (p.145). I found that the recorder enabled me to concentrate on making more
complete contextual notes. It also allowed me to suspend judgment in that I was not filtering the classroom discourse by selecting what bits to record or not to record. I had no real participant role in the classes, other than the effects of my presence which I sensed to be minimal in some rooms and quite significant in others. I transcribed the audio tapes of each of the classes and expanded the transcription into field notes with my on-site notes.

**Project Sessions**

My level of participation as logistics coordinator and Highlands faculty member more often than not precluded careful observation and field note making during the Project sessions. I did, however, audio tape many of the Phase II large group sessions. I attended and/or audio taped several of the secondary small group sessions. And, I attended as a participant/observer three of the four Phase II VTE classes, which I also audio taped. I did not make extensive field notes on any of the sessions.

**Other Audio Tapes**

Halfway through the student teaching term I asked each of the Clinical Faculty members who were working with me to audio tape samples of their talk with their student teachers
for about 15 minutes twice each week for the remainder of the term. (See Appendix -- Memos to Informants.) Although I knew there would be variability in the way they approached the task -- and there was -- I needed some way to corroborate the self-report data of Interviews #3 and #4.

**Artifacts**

**Comments on Listening to CT-ST Talk**

In June, I asked each of the teacher informants to listen to the tapes of their talk with their student teachers and to respond in writing to two questions:

1. What did you learn about working with student teachers from listening to these tapes?
2. What did you learn about yourself as a teacher-educator from listening to the tapes? (See Appendix -- Memos to Informants.)

Two of the four were able to tape some of their talk and did make written comments on it as I had asked. Due to technical difficulty, the science teacher's tapes were blank when she went to listen. The English teacher recorded, but did not make any written comments. Thus, there were unavoidable omissions from the data sets for those two individuals.
Phase I Work Samples

As noted above, I had filed away all of the work samples from the Phase I Project sessions. Once I had identified the Clinical Faculty members who would become my research partners, I took the Phase I data set to Sparta High and asked each of them to identify their own handwriting. Having the data sorted by group and day made the task easy and also meant I could be fairly confident of accuracy in the identification.

Phase I and II Responses

At the beginning of two of the Phase II sessions, Project leaders asked the members of each group if they had any thoughts about their involvement in the Project that they would like the share at the time. I also asked my informants to identify their contributions to those written responses.

By the time we met in the final session at Highlands, I believed the informants were so accustomed to my recording everything they said or wrote that my asking them to put their names on their response cards would not compromise the integrity of the research. That request meant that I did not have to ask them to sort through the cards later. I
also arranged to have different colored cards used for responses to each of the questions which made compiling that data much easier and more likely to be accurate.

Journal

In order to preserve a "natural history of the inquiry" (Erickson, 1986, p.152), a record of the changes in my perceptions and thinking as the study progressed, I began a research journal when Phase II of the Project began. The entries for January through mid-March were especially helpful.

Data Analysis

In naturalistic inquiry, data analysis is ongoing from the time the researcher enters the field of study. Interpretation is involved in the selection of informants, in the structuring of interview questions, and in the attending to or the not attending to observed phenomena. Guba and Lincoln (1981) note that "The information-collection process continues even when [the researcher] is not consciously aware of it" (p.134). Thus, the most important instrument used in naturalistic inquiry is the researcher himself or herself (Merriam, 1988).
Erickson's Analytic Narrative Method

Erickson (1986) suggests that the researcher should begin making assertions while in the field and then look for confirming and disconfirming evidence. Through this process of "analytic induction," the task of the researcher is to show that "adequate evidentiary warranty exists for the assertions" (p.149).

Once intensive analysis begins, Erickson recommends that the researcher read through the text of the field notes and/or interview transcripts looking for confirming and disconfirming evidence for each low-inference assertion that has been generated. Assertions that have good support in multiple data sources become major assertions and the main points to be brought out in the report of the findings of the study.

Erickson's three components of the report on the findings include narrative vignettes, general description, and interpretive commentary. The narrative vignettes present the "concrete particulars" from everyday life and are the researcher's attempt to convince the reader that it did, indeed, happen the way it is presented (p.150). In the general description, the researcher shows patterns to illustrate the typicality of the events and/or informants' views that are presented. It is also appropriate for the
researcher to indicate the frequency of actions and/or statements.

Interpretive commentary (Erickson, 1986) may both precede and follow each narrative vignette. Its purpose is to connect the specific details of the vignette to the abstract argument. It foreshadows what the reader is to see in the vignette and aids in retrospective understanding of the significance of the patterns the researcher has found. It is in the interpretive commentary that the "natural history of the inquiry" (p.152) becomes useful as the researcher accounts for changes in his or her thinking during the course of the data collection and analysis.

**Variations on the Erickson Analytic Narrative Method**

For this study, I used the Erickson method of analysis with two variations. First, the process used to generate assertions is even more inductive than Erickson's approach. Second, because I worked primarily with interview data, representative excerpts from the transcripts are given in support of major assertions. They are corroborated with evidence from other data sources. Some of the corroborating evidence is included in the report where it serves to give emphasis and/or elaboration.
I developed this more inductive approach in conducting a pilot study of the beliefs about teaching and learning of three English teachers. I found that it kept me from losing sight of important bits of information and at the same time yielded assertions that were corroborated by the findings of a second analysis method that I had applied to the same data.

Creating Assertion Lists

To identify what I came to call "mini-assertions," I slowly read through the texts of the interviews and the expanded field notes. Each time I could make a low-inference observation that was supported by the text, I wrote it as a mini-assertion in the wide right margin. Because I isolated details, my "mini-assertion" lists were extensive and fairly specific. Using my research questions numbers, I coded each mini-assertion according to its related question, placing the number in the left margin. Initially, because some were related to more than one research question, some had two, some three, number codes. The double coding allowed me flexibility in determining where that bit of information eventually would be represented in the report.
Identifying Major and Minor Assertions

I worked with the interviews first because they offered the most complete corpus of information and they were organized similarly. As I wrote the mini-assertions, I noted that some were similar and I tried to use similar wording for like meanings, but I made no overt attempt to compare them at that time.

I then organized the mini-assertions by research questions. As I did so, I aggregated the discrete bits somewhat by identifying any mini-assertions that seemed closely enough related that I could make a more inclusive assertion from the mini-assertions. Once I had identified the more general assertions, I transferred them to cards color-coded by informant, writing only one assertion on each card. Under each assertion, I documented the sources with the numbers from the original interview mini-assertion list. If I knew there was support in the observation field notes or one of the artifacts, I noted it in my research journal, but I waited until I worked with that data source to add it to the card.

When I had gone through all of the research questions with the interview lists, I coded the original observation mini-assertion lists with the research question numbers and went through the process again. Then, I did the same with
the work samples and other data sources from the sessions. When I listened to the tapes of each of the sessions where the informant was present, I made notes and/or transcribed bits that offered further support for my assertions. I did the same with the tapes of the conferences between the student teacher and the Clinical Faculty member. Missing data sources were simply omitted from the procedure. In each case, I made careful notation of the source on the card for each assertion.

In order to identify what were to become my major assertions, I checked the support that I had for each, color-coded according to data source. If an assertion had repeated support in the interview data and was based on at least three data sources, it qualified as a major assertion. If an assertion had only two data sources for support, but had extensive support in the interview data, I labeled it a minor assertion. In some cases I used artifacts and/or my journal as corroborating support for major and minor assertions, and documented the source in each case. This, then, is the process I used to achieve triangulation in the findings.
Reporting the Findings

To share the findings, I organized each of the four case studies into four main sections, including (1) a brief professional biography of the informant, (2) the informant's views of teaching and learning, (3) ways the informant believed the Project sessions informed her teaching and her work with her student teacher, and (4) apparent changes in the informant's views of herself as a teacher educator. Because I used the research questions to help organize the analysis, the reports of the cases could be organized somewhat similarly.

Credibility

In positivistic approaches to research, credibility must be provided for up front in the selection of instruments to be used to measure what is conceived of as the external reality being studied. In naturalistic research, the focus is on socially-constructed meanings rather than external realities, and it is during the collection and analysis of data that the researcher provides for or fails to provide for credibility. Guba and Lincoln (1981) suggest that the most important credibility check in naturalistic research is internal validity because internal validity constitutes reliability.
Validity

Internal Validity

The researcher's main goal in naturalistic research is accurately to represent the findings. It is not absolute truths that are sought, but findings that are accurate to the investigator's experience (Merriam, 1988). The findings must accurately represent the socially-constructed reality of the informants, their perspectives, their view of their world and their work.

I have already described several of the steps I took in this study to provide for internal validity. They included triangulation of the data; observations of and interviews with the four teachers across time; involving the subjects as research partners whenever possible, including their review of the field notes and interview transcripts; and accounting for researcher effects through careful noting of researcher perspectives and changes in thinking during collection and analysis of data.

External Validity

I provided for external validity by using data collection and analysis procedures tested and proven by
others and familiar to the research community. Any variations from the familiar methods that I undertook, I described carefully.

Reliability

In experimental research, reliability involves the potential for the study to be replicated with consistent findings and the generalizability of the findings across other samples of similar populations. Because the researcher is the main instrument in naturalistic research (Merriam, 1988 and others), the concept of reliability is problematic (Guba and Lincoln, 1981; Merriam, 1988 and others). In any event, to assure credibility of this study, I give attention to reliability as it has been considered relevant to naturalistic research.

As noted above, I have accounted for the roles of the researcher in the study, including conscious intrusions of researcher bias and changes in thinking during the course of the study. Data analysis included triangulation of the data and a careful description of procedures followed.

In this study, as noted in Chapter 1, I was looking not for generalizability of the findings of this study, but through the particular to contribute to a "concrete universal" knowledge of interactive approaches to inservice teacher education in clinical supervision (Erickson, 1986).
CHAPTER FIVE
FOUR CLINICAL FACULTY MEMBERS AT SPARTA HIGH SCHOOL

In this chapter findings of the study are presented in the form of case studies of four Project participants who teach at the same high school and who were involved in the secondary section of the Project during Phase II. (See Appendix -- Timetable.) The teachers and their subjects areas are

Carmen Sparks -- Spanish
Donna Matthews -- Mathematics
Janet Harmon -- Science
Joan Brinkley -- English

Each of the case studies includes: (1) a brief professional biography; (2) a discussion of the teacher's perspectives on teaching and learning arranged by topics; and (3) a discussion of how that teacher's work, especially her work with student teachers, was informed by her involvement in the Project. Part 3 is arranged by topics and chronologically within topics as appropriate.

The Case of Carmen Sparks

A veteran of 14 years of teaching, Carmen Sparks has taught at Sparta High School for the past five years. She
teaches Spanish I, II, and III.

**Professional Biography of Carmen Sparks**

Carmen Sparks learned Spanish when she lived in Mexico from ages five to ten. After she had returned to the United States, one day her sixth grade teacher asked her to teach some Spanish words to her classmates. From that time on, Carmen knew what she wanted to do. She described her decision to teach as responding to a "calling," and joked, "It was either that or be a nun."

In her 14 years of teaching, Carmen has had only 3 student teachers, all from Allegheny State. Though she had some problems in the past with two of them who, in her judgment, were not prepared for teaching, she enjoys working with student teachers. She believes her ability in the past to keep the lines of communication open was one of the factors that may have been involved in her selection for the Clinical Faculty Project.

**Carmen Sparks on Teaching and Learning**

For Carmen Sparks, teaching is a performance where the teacher is often the center of attention, but the learner and the learning are at the heart of the exchange. She believes that she and other teachers who desire to do so
continue to improve with experience. From her perspective, an important role of the teacher is to organize and simplify information for students. Thus, to her, good teachers are well planned and well organized. She is very clear that she expects to be in control at all times and that learning time will be valued in her classroom.

**Teaching as a Performance**

The first time I interviewed Carmen Sparks, I asked her what I would see if I visited her classroom. She responded,

You would probably see me walking around the room constantly. You would see students responding to me, for the most part. To me, it's like a performance, and that's how I view it. And I think in essence that's what we do every day is we have a performance. Either the performance goes well or it doesn't go well. (Interview #1)

When she talked about teaching in the interviews and Project sessions, she often used show business metaphors such as "working the show," "working the room," and "developing a rhythm," and described how she watches the faces of the members of her audience for their response.

To me, rhythm is .... Actually, you can use another word, momentum -- keeping things going, keeping things alive so that they're not just dead or under the tables. I think that it's very important that things move quickly. I'm looking at my students, I'm looking at their faces to see if the eyebrows are up or down. Looking for the vital signs. (Interview #1)
The day I asked if I might observe in one of her Spanish classes, Carmen told me I was welcome to come in during the next period if I had time to stay. A few minutes later, her dark eyes said, "Welcome," and she greeted me with a broad smile. Students filed into and out of Room 227. I took a seat near the back of the room as she responded to a student's question. She had little advance notice, but she turned in a fine performance, one that was true to her description.

The desks were arranged in about 8 rows of varying length—all on diagonals to the walls and facing the center in a horseshoe of rows, leaving an arena of space in the center of the room. Carmen's teacher desk was at the front of the room to my right. I asked, "Where will you be?" and she responded, "Everywhere."

She moved around the room. Her expression was pleasant. Her voice tone and volume varied and yet they were consistent. I felt a rhythm in her speech, in her teaching. She spoke to students close to her and farther away. Her hands and feet were continually moving as she gestured, walked, leaned. Though her smile was slightly controlled, her black eyes flashed. She looked directly at individual students. They responded, remaining attentive even if she was addressing another student. She used the
board, but kept returning to close proximity to the class between each example she wrote on the board.

When she finished the lesson, she paused -- slightly dramatically "That's...the lesson...of today. That's it."

A student joked with her, "For today?"

"No, no, no, no! We have a lot of written work to do today, so Carmelita cut you some slack. Instead of making you take your apunde about the present tense...." She dramatically produced a dittoed handout with notes on it. The students responded together, "Ah, Carmelita."

"You see, you can put this in your notebook. It has holes punched for your convenience. It's very simple. It's the perfect tense, a review, but with a new twist. We have some "-car" verbs some "-gar" verbs. You're gonna see some of these in the reading and you're not gonna say 'Where does that come from?'--well, you're gonna know. You'll be knowledgeable; you'll have it all together.

"If you need help, if there's something you're having trouble with, raise your hand. I'll come around. Vamos."

Carmen moved around the room, stopping to help individuals and frequently looking up to monitor the others. She did not stay with one student long.

Although she would probably agree that she demands student attention toward her during explanations and
especially during oral drill and response, she wants the classroom focus to be on student learning of the target language. In the small group discussion with her foreign language colleagues in the Project, Carmen said, "My biggest concern is getting the reactions from the students and really seeing, 'Are they learning or are they not learning?' You see the focus changes from you to the learner" (3/6).

Her interest in monitoring student reactions and developing a rhythm can be seen in the responses Carmen gave to Phase I Project tasks. When asked to list her main concerns as an experienced teacher, she wrote, "What mood are they in? Once I identify, I can adapt" (Concerns Task 10/28). In describing what she saw in a written case, she noted that the teacher kept the momentum of the discussion going (Description Task 10/28). In describing the two students of her brief case studies, she noted that the one about whom she felt positive, "kept eyes on me as I taught" and the one about whom she felt negative, "did not keep eyes on me as I taught new material" (Analysis Task 1 -- 11/2).

In one of the taped conferences between Carmen and her student teacher, Annie talked at length about focusing on the responses in the students' faces as she taught a lesson that day (4/5). In the final taped conference, Annie said,
"One of the main things I've learned is 'workin' the show' -- to quote from you -- 'workin' the show' (5/2).

**Improving the 'Show'**

Although Carmen Sparks recognizes that not all of her colleagues strive to improve, she believes she can continue to learn about teaching so that her 'act' will improve. One way for her to learn is to work with a beginner. She told me,

I think the longer you do it, if you're truly concerned, you learn how to shift the gears and how to move things more and more smoothly and keep the rhythm going in the classroom. I think it's very easy for teachers to kind of just give up, pretty much put themselves on autopilot and proceed. I guess I'm not that type of person. I always am looking for new ways, for better ways, changing. Boy, you certainly do change from year to year. I love to work with the student teachers because of the energy that you get from them -- their ideas. They're creative -- having classes on recent methods, and probably they're more up to date on what's new and innovative. And I look forward to learning that, they teach me as well as I teach them. (Interview #1)

Another way to assure that the performances are good is to plan carefully. On her list of concerns as an experienced teacher, Carmen also wrote, "Planning exact day to introduce material for maximum benefit" (Concerns Task 10/28).
Their ability to plan for instruction is of primary concern in her work with student teachers. The two with whom she worked previously had problems with planning.

They did not fully comprehend the importance of being prepared or having the lesson prepared. And, of course, I think that's one thing everybody knows that in teaching, that's critical. ...not knowing what to do with the last ten minutes when they finished up early. I talk to the student teacher and say this is the importance of lesson planning. I wanted to get them into the habit of preparing more than what they needed, and to be flexible enough to be able to use what was left over the next day and incorporate that into the next day's plan.

(Interview #1)

From the beginning, Carmen emphasized planning with Annie. Early in their time together, she told him, "I gave her today a couple, an extra planning period so that she could actually put pen to paper and start working on her written lesson plans, how to organize that and, by the end of the day, she's well on her way" (Interview #1).

Her ability to plan for instruction was one of the qualities that Carmen most appreciated in Annie. "She's good, very good. She's very well organized. She has lesson plans to me. She writes things out. In the past, I've had to work a lot harder"

(Interview #4).
Carmen enjoys her best moments in her own teaching when she is able to organize and simplify the material for her students. In order to do that, she must plan carefully.

When the plan is well thought out and when we're doing something that is stimulating to the students, a challenge for me is to take something that is traditionally known as a bear as far as grammar is concerned and turn it into something that is so simple, they all catch on very quickly. And being able to do that, it's very much like a performance. (Interview #1)

She realizes the value of students figuring some things out for themselves, however. At the end of the class I observed she said to me,

I used to give them these particular things--the vocabulary they would have trouble with beforehand, and then they could just refer to that list as they went along. In other words I wasn't helping them. The object of second semester is to start to break them, to move them away from that. To have them work and come to grips with it on their own without me providing that--just by looking at the list that's provided. I can see that it's starting to pay off. Usually we wouldn't spend a great deal of time in class doing an activity like that, but the first time -- until they get their feet wet -- I like to watch so I can help them and they can feel confident. In the future I may assign for them to do it, to break it up a translation such as what they're doing now over a couple of nights.

Keeping the Show under Control

Carmen Sparks' classroom is a business-like, but friendly environment where learning time is valued and where
students appear to be interested in their work and are generally quite cooperative. When she described what I would see if I visited her classroom, I had anticipated something of a benevolent dictatorship. Carmen had said, "You would probably draw the conclusion that things were pretty much under control here and that something was happening. You'd see some laughter" (Interview #1).

The word control came up quite often when Carmen talked about her work. In describing the classroom interaction in the written case, Carmen noted when the teacher was and was not "in control" (10/28). In her talk with her student teacher, at one point she asked Annie in which of two sections she had more control that day (3/3). In the first interview, she said,

There's a lot of discipline in the classroom. I'm really big on discipline, because I think that in order to get the job done you have to have as much control as possible. But yet at the same time, it can't be -- with the subject matter that I teach -- it can't be so rigid, so disciplined, that they're afraid to do the task -- that is, to speak Spanish. They're already self conscious enough, especially at this particular age in high school where anything that they say, anything that they do, is just as they would say, 'embarrassing.' You have to get them relaxed a little bit, so I wear different hats as the commander-in-chief, and at the same time, I like to have humor in the classroom. We laugh a lot, and I think that kind of puts them at ease.
Indeed, they did laugh a lot the day I observed, but it was always related to the learning of the language. At one point she asked a young man what he liked best about his job. He responded in Spanish, "The money."

Students in Carmen's class learn not only that she is in control, but that they are expected to control themselves. She believes that good teachers teach students where the limits are set. She noted, "One thing I think they do experience with me is when to draw the line" (Interview #1). Another of Carmen's criticisms of the teacher in one of the written cases was that she "has not taught the class how to behave" (10/28).

In the classroom, Carmen gave both verbal and non-verbal cues that time is valuable and not to be wasted. She told students, "We have to be efficient, get the job done. The purpose of what we're going to do today is to work with the translation of the lesson," and "Quickly, take a look at this." She also moved quickly herself as she went from one to another (2/9).

Another of her concerns as a teacher is "Having time to cover the lesson" (10/28). She noted that in the lesson she taped for Analysis Task 2, she did a "good job of staying on task" (11/16).
Being organized and in control were important to Carmen before she began the Clinical Faculty Project. By mid-February, she credited her work in the Project as having helped her to improve both.

I just feel so much more organized, so much more together, and I feel that this can't help but shine through with working with the student teacher, and it really actually puts me in a better light as being organized and in control. (Interview #2)

Carmen Sparks and the Clinical Faculty Project

Carmen Sparks linked various changes in her work with her students and with her student teacher to Project tasks and discussions.

The Project Discussion Sessions

Three of the topics addressed in the January through April sessions appear to have had an impact on Carmen's teaching and her supervision of her current student teacher. Carmen cited the "Remembering Student Teaching" task (1/11) when she talked about becoming more sensitive to the needs and perspectives of her students and her student teacher. She linked her having become more organized and focused in orienting Kelly to Project discussions about planning for the student teacher's arrival in the school. Her increased
awareness of student teaching as a developmental process can be traced to various small and larger group sessions of the second semester.

Sensitivity to Needs, Perspectives. Carmen Sparks is a teacher who is very aware of her students' feelings. She takes care to give positive reinforcement to individuals and to the class as a group. When students responded in the class I observed, she said, "Bien" or "Muy bien." Sometimes she raised her eyebrows to show approval. Sometimes she added, "Perfecto." To the class, she said, "I tell you, I'm really impressed that some of you are recognizing your objective pronouns, your directs, and your indirects"(Observation 2/9).

In describing the classroom interaction of the teacher in the first written case, she noted, "He does not humiliate the student" and "He said, 'That's right.'" In describing the interaction of the teacher in the second case, Carmen wrote, "She doesn't use a lot of positive reinforcement"; "She does not seem interested in the students' ideas and interpretations"; and "She is quick to lose her temper and blames the students for her lack of control" (10/28). When she analyzed the tape of her own teaching, she noted, "Many students may lack confidence" (Analysis Task 2 -- 11/16).
Carmen's sensitivity to students is also reflected in her talk with her student teacher in two of their taped conferences. In early March she said to Annie, "I loved the way you handled that discussion. You first called on volunteers and did not force it with those that didn't want to read. They're really embarrassed, and everything is embarrassing to them" (3/3). In another conference, she told her, "In teaching you have to learn not necessarily to make your students adapt, but you have to work with them, and you have to adapt to where they are. You have to respond to their needs as well as they have to respond to what you want them to do. So it's a working together" (4/6).

When I asked her how her teaching had been different this year, she responded, "Probably I've just been more tuned in to moving on when students are ready to move on. Rather than being so worried about a deadline or a calendar" (Interview #4).

This year, Carmen became much more aware of the needs and perspectives of her student teacher than she had been in the past. She described herself as having come "to see student teaching through different eyes" and that she has "been able to think of the fact of how important that is" (Interview #2). She contrasted her work with this year's
student teacher with that of previous ones,

It has given me a new outlook and a new way, being able to empathize and to remember and to recall my own situation when I was student teaching -- the things I wished that somebody had done for me -- that particular way of thinking versus the other times that I've had student teachers. (Interview #2)

She acknowledged the effect of the Project discussions as she thought again about those two former student teachers who struggled with their planning.

I think I would probably handle things a little bit different. I would still want to take care of the problem right away with the lesson plans and all, but I think in other areas I would probably do things differently. I might be a little more sensitive to them instead of being so blunt and blatant. I might try to be more delicate. (Interview #1)

In addition to the "Remembering Student Teaching" task, Carmen linked her newfound level of sensitivity to the "Concerns" task of Phase I.

In the task [where we looked at] things that might be of concern to me versus things that might be a concern to my student teacher -- as a result of that activity, I think that the high priority concerns would be "What do I do if?" and "Where is this or that?" for the student teacher versus not so high for an experienced teacher because we know. The result of that idea was the development of the packet that I put together of answers to those types of concerns to the student teacher. I tried to have it there for her so that she wouldn't have to feel that she's asked me that question two or three times, but she's forgotten, and then she'll need to know very badly but she'll be afraid to ask because she'll feel she's making a fool of
herself. I put myself in the mind set that, in working with my student teacher, it's better if I make no assumptions. I pretty much want to stand back and take me back to my student teaching days and to think about what were things that could have helped me. (Interview #3)

In addition to anticipating Annie's need for answers to her questions, Carmen was sensitive to other concerns. When she and her foreign language colleagues discussed the problem of the expectations of the university supervisor differing from those of the cooperating teacher, Carmen said, "My concern with that came from the fact that I view my student teacher also as a student of mine -- I bleed for her" (3/6). She also was careful not to give negative non-verbal signals to Annie while she was teaching.

I think I was very conscious not to do that because I thought that would probably throw her off, and I wouldn't want for her to be in a situation where it would make her uncomfortable and perhaps even make her stop in mid-sentence. Students, I fear, would get the message of, 'Well, she has to check with Mommy to see if it is OK.' I never wanted her to be in that position because I never would want to be in that position. I tried to be very conscious of never sending out a message to her that she was not doing something right. It's just too difficult to 'work the show' and know that, 'Oh, gosh, I have screwed up something,' and 'She is probably angry with me.' And I never wanted her to feel that way. (Interview #4)

This student teacher was appreciative of the sensitivity. In their final taped conference, she told
Carmen, "I don't think I could have done it without you, without the encouragement, advice, the support, the reality of the criticism. You made it clear. 'This is what's wrong. It's not you. It's your behavior'" (Taped Conference 5/2).

From Carmen's perspective, her increased sensitivity to her student teacher was, perhaps, the most important outcome of the Project sessions.

I think that the one thing that it has taught me above all is to try to be more receptive to and tuned in to the feelings of the student teacher. It came from the task that we had to think back on our own student teaching, to how you worked with your cooperating teacher. I think it was going back and trying to get into that experience that made me open my eyes and say, 'Gee, if I do remember how I felt when I was student teaching....' This year I tried to be kind and gentle and at the same time be constructive and to guide, but it has been in a much different way. (interview #4)

One aspect of that "different way" for Carmen was the systematic way she organized for her student teacher's introduction to the school and classroom communities and for her induction to teaching.

**Planned, Intentional Orientation.** Carmen was aware of the need for such organization early in the second semester of the Project year. In the first secondary large group session, Project leaders had the Clinical Faculty members
list implications for their work with student teachers that remembering their own experiences had brought to mind. Carmen wrote, "Plan induction to student teaching" and "Work for released time to deal with student teacher orientation" (1/11)

Later, after she had been working with Annie for about two weeks, she described what she had done differently this year.

Before she came I organized things that I felt would be helpful to her -- information for her to have. That consisted of digging up a student handbook. I also took out my teacher's handbook and went through the index and wrote on a sheet of paper -- which I clipped to that binder -- sections that she should read in her free time while she's here, topics that I think she should be familiar with. The idea of the handbook for organizational purposes and orientation of the school -- that was something that came from the Project. I made a list of also who's who and the scheme of things here at school. I think that's important, at least, and the little note as to what characteristics would help her identify these people. I feel when you're bombarded with so many new names and faces that it's so difficult. I had trouble with that when I began my student teaching. Of course I got this idea from our last session as a group of Clinical Faculty. And, it's been most useful and most beneficial because it avoided both of us asking questions and going around and round in trying to remember things as I had done in the past with student teachers. I wasn't quite as organized when they were here at my doorstep. (Interview #2)
She continued, describing what those first days were like with previous student teachers.

They met whoever happened to cross our path at a particular time. No real effort was made to take them in any kind of sequential manner around the school to introduce them to key personnel. I was not really organized. There was no plan. There was a plan, yes, but there was no organization to the extent that I have been organized this particular time. There was no Carmen Sparks' special-made-handbook. There was nothing quite to that extent. In the past it was always writing down things on the back of absentees and this, that or the other. It wasn't even organized in any fashion. And I think that I found that we just kind of took things as they happened. This year it was very, very organized, the whole process. And, and I think that is because of the activities that we did all along throughout the year. We are further along in this particular situation. After a certain amount of time, it seems like things are jelling more quickly this particular time than they were previously.

(Interview #2)

In the next interview, she described her work with former student teachers as, "flying by the seat of my pants" (Interview #3).

Carmen was the most clear about how her work with Annie was different when she looked back on the student teaching term in retrospect. Early in May, she said,

It has been with thinking before speaking. Whereas before I may have reacted and may have pointed out things to a student teacher, uh, just without totally thinking it through or thinking that I might hurt their feelings, or there could be a more tactful way to say something or to point out something.

(Interview #4)
Carmen Sparks' more sensitive and intentional approach to working with Annie combined with her increasingly explicit knowledge about the developmental process of becoming a teacher to create a very positive experience for both of them.

**Student Teaching as a Developmental Process.** The concept of learning to teach being a developmental process did not originate for Carmen Sparks with her involvement in the Clinical Faculty Project. At the initial session, she listed "Helps others develop the craft of teaching" as one of the necessary traits of a good cooperating teacher (10/26). Her sense of that process with former student teachers seems to have been a general awareness, however, rather than steps she could identify explicitly. With reference to their planning skills, she indicated a somewhat vague sense of improvement over time: "I think that they got the hang of it by the end of their student teaching experience" (Interview #1).

The way she phased previous student teachers into teaching was very similar to the way she started Annie:

They observed first. And this usually took about a week. Then after that, we would mutually agree on a portion of class that they would take until they felt confident enough to take it -- take the class for the entire period. After they taught one class for a week or two then they would add on two and then the following week add on three classes to teach. (Interview #2)
Granted, one important difference between Annie and the others was Carmen's sense of their preparation to teach. She had serious doubts about the former student teachers from the beginning. She saw the potential in Annie at once. In describing Annie after two weeks with her, Carmen said,

My impression has been most favorable. I find that she is very well prepared. I mean when I say that she's very well prepared -- her speaking ability is very good. I have observed that she is very quick to observe a situation in class. She has given me some insight to students' behaviors and reasons why they might be behaving as they do, and I think pretty much she's been right on the money. (Interview #2)

Another important difference, however, is that from late January through April, while she was working with Annie, Carmen regularly discussed with other cooperating teachers and Project leaders the stages of development that student teachers go through and how the roles of the cooperating teacher and the supervisor change in response to those different stages. With only two foreign language Clinical Faculty members in the Project, Carmen had ample opportunity to talk about her sense of Annie's changes across time, especially in the small group sessions. She often used phrases such as "By this point..." and "At that point..." (3/6).
Realizing that she should not overwhelm Annie at first, Carmen introduced procedures and policies systematically. Carmen told me that she delayed giving Annie

...things that I knew that she would not need right away. I had the readings marked and the order prioritized, but kept that here at school so that she wouldn't have everything to take the first time. So it was giving her information, but not all at once. At a different time it would be appropriate to touch on things such as discipline, how to fold papers or hand those in, and what make-up work and so on. That is something that's coming down the pipe. And I felt that these were things that at first I would see if she could observe. (Interview #3)

She took care not to overwhelm her with details at first, but Carmen indicated her intention to move Annie to the role of her colleague from the beginning. The first day Annie was in the school, they exchanged information about themselves.

We talked about.... I asked her how she came to be interested in Spanish, about her family, if she had brothers and sisters and where she was from. Those are the types of things that we discussed -- more personal things -- to get to know her as a person. And I shared some of me with her also. (Interview #2)

Although she remained in the role of the mentor, Carmen's approach to lesson planning with Annie was also very collegial.

We sat down together, side by side, and I went through possible options of how to organize or where to start in the lesson --
many different starting points working with language, with vocabulary or grammar, and presented three options as to possible ways that it is a workable plan to begin, the starting point. And I asked her what she felt most comfortable with, and for her to give me her opinion of where she would like to start and why. We just kind of worked together with that. I did not want her to feel that this is absolutely the way it must be done, and I don't want you to deviate from this plan. Because that's not the type of relationship that I want for us.

(Interview # 2)

In mid-March, Carmen articulated her sense of this developing colleague relationship.

Our conversations are informal. They're even about particular students and how they're performing in the classroom. And we're having little talks about little things. I feel more like a coach. As time passes I find that our work together is more as true colleagues than the student teacher/cooperating teacher situation. Probably by the end of her student teaching experience here, it will be a feeling of 'one of the girls in the department.'

(Interview #3)

Near the end of the student teaching term, Carmen described their planning as teamwork. "We worked together as a team, trying to come up with some projects -- looking at a lesson and saying, 'What if we have them to do this?'; 'They might enjoy that'; or 'Let's play this game or that game, and we would stress this.'"

In one of the small group meetings to which the two foreign language student teachers were invited, Carmen
articulated her view of how the relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher changes during the term. She said to Annie,

I think it's very difficult for us to be in the role we're in and having to say, "Well, consider this." "Have you looked at this?" "I observed this." "Perhaps you might try this." That's fine to a point, but I think that my role in doing that has got to stop a little bit and I think it's the student teacher who at that point has to start saying, "Well, let's talk about how I did what I did. I think that it worked," or "I don't think that it worked," and why. At some point the roles have to reverse to where you're telling me what you think rather than the cooperating teacher telling you what I think.  

(Interview #4)

Although her sense of the developmental process of learning to teach may have been intuitive and somewhat general when she began the Project, by the end of the student teaching term, she was able to very clearly line out three developmental stages that she believes the student teacher passes through. Using her show business metaphor once again, Carmen told me how she let Annie progress through a series of steps.

First of all, I wanted her.... I split it up into three phases: the first phase was to let her work just on content, and it was a good thing. We didn't have to focus then on so much classroom management. Students were very well behaved. Phase 2 was -- now that you have the content and the lesson plan and the objective -- now that you are doing fine, you are just on cruise control. Let's now start to look at what I call 'working the
show' -- working with the students, looking at the students as you are presenting this fabulous lesson you have spent hours on preparing, but watching them, watching their faces being tuned in to the students, and zapping the ones who are talking, and, you know, keeping the rhythm of the classroom going. And then, Phase 3 was the solo. You are on your own. I have to step out now, and just rely on your telling me how things went, and I want to get a sense of what it feels like to be in there on your own. And that was phase 3. And it was very shortly after we started into the classroom management phase that she was on her solo.

(Interview #4)

Though she may not yet have made the connection, Carmen chunks the development of her Spanish students into similar phases. When I observed her teaching, she said,

"Ok. Muy bien. How many of you wrote passere -- 'to pass'? A new wrinkle to the story--the verb passere--whenever you use it with any kind of time takes on the meaning of 'spending time.' So, let's polish that up a little bit. You passed the summer? Ok. Sharper? 'Spent the summer.' Ok? Yes, a grammar point."

They continued translating, and Carmen responded, "Muy bien," and repeated what the student had said. "Next, Teresa? You didn't get that part? Ok. Who's got that last sentence? I feel confident that you can solo on your own through the rest of the paragraph. You owe me this for tomorrow" (Observation 2/9).

Learning to teach, not unlike learning to speak Spanish, involves working slowly and carefully to establish
the foundation; trying it with assistance; and finally, the solo performance -- going it alone.

The Thinking about Teaching Task

Though Carmen was engaged in lots of talk about developmental stages during the second Phase of the Project, it was, perhaps, her response to one task in October that eventually enabled her to help prepare Annie to 'solo.' Carmen credits the Phase I "Thinking about Teaching" task with her becoming aware of a difference between giving Annie observations and giving her judgments. With that new understanding, she developed a way to move from direct to less direct to indirect supervision strategies.

Differentiating Observations and Judgments. After Carmen had been working with Annie for several weeks, I reconstructed the "Thinking about Teaching" task for her and asked her if she could make any connection between having done that task and her work as a cooperating teacher. She replied,

I think it's probably that very task that helped me to look at or to work on how to evaluate a student teacher more precisely than the way I had in the past. I think probably in the past I would base a great deal of my observation on judgment rather than strict observations, or my evaluation of a performance based more on judgment. I know it was based more on judgment than observation. I hadn't even thought much about the two. And I think that judgment was
probably a result of how I do things or how I perceive things should be done rather than looking objectively at whatever the case may be. And I found that probably to be the most worthwhile of all the tasks that we've done in terms of how do we evaluate. It seems that after you are in the mind set -- putting yourself through the series of activities that we did -- into the mind set, it becomes more and more easy to separate judgment from observation. (Interview #3)

When I asked her to give an example of the difference she saw between the two types of responses, she continued,

I may have observed a particular task that she had the students do, such as.... The directions were to take out your work sheets. She told students to take out their work sheets and began orally to check the answers to the work sheet. I may not have written any judgment as to how I saw her performance or the students in that particular activity, but when we're reviewing that, she might say to me "they're not studying", "they're not responding fast enough". That sort of thing. (Interview #3)

In order to separate what she saw happening in the classroom from how she valued the effectiveness of the behaviors observed, Carmen developed an interesting system for recording notes about Annie's teaching. She explained:

I have a spiral notebook, and I list all of the activities that the student teacher is doing throughout the period. First thing, "Calls the roll," etc., almost like a script, but not probably as complete and as detailed as if I were scripting a class. I listed first, second, third, fourth, fifth. Those are observations. Those are my observations on that sheet. I have another note pad which is yellow in color, a little tiny legal note pad on which I put down things, topics for us to discuss at break time or during the in
school suspension, when we have time to spend
time together to chat about what's happening.
(Interview #3)

She went on to describe how she used a different color
of ink to make notes for each of Annie's classes. As Annie
did each of the activities in the second and third classes,
Carmen checked it off with the pen for that class. Thus,
they had a complete record of the day.

It does many things in doing it that way
because it can be a document that would be
proof as to what particular topics the
student teacher has covered, what things,
what information she may have omitted in one
period and needs to pick up on the next day,
or if she's following the true lesson plan
three times and pretty much getting through
the three activities. (Interview #3)

Another strategy Carmen used was to audio tape one of
Annie's classes. Carmen wanted her to have an objective
record of the day's events. She also wanted Annie to hear
herself because she had a tendency to say the word okay
frequently. Carmen confided, "Rather than tell her about
the idiosyncracy, I knew she could figure that out herself,
privately. I didn't give her any direction for analysis. I
just said, 'Here, you might find that interesting'"
(Interview #3).

Carmen was able to develop ways to move from telling
Annie what to do and what to think about her teaching
because she found ways to facilitate Annie's making
decisions about what to do in the classroom and how to think about what she had done.

**Moving from Direct to Indirect Supervision.** In retrospect, Carmen had a good sense of how she provided a scaffold for Annie's development. Near the end of Annie's time with her, she described it this way.

Instead of me jumping in feet first with the student teacher when he or she taught a lesson as I have done in the past, with this experience I have pretty much let her tell me how she felt, how things went. I wanted her to talk about something specific, I would probably just drop the little questions, the little phrase that might get her on that particular subject I wanted. I wanted her to talk about her impressions -- how she felt first. And if she wanted a suggestion, I wanted her to be in the position to ask instead of me telling her how things should be, because I realize that I can't stifle her creativity, and that she is probably is going to do things differently from the way that I am doing things. The bottom line was that I was only going to jump the gun or interfere if I felt that the learning process of my students was being disrupted. That was going along in a good flow, but I wanted her to pretty much assess the situation that happened in the classroom, and my role is mainly as an advisor -- more of a support person.

(Interview #4)

Samples of her talk with Annie taped on three dates across time corroborate her description of that process. On March 3, Carmen began by asking Annie an open-ended question: "How do you feel about first and second?" She extended it immediately with "What do you think you did that
worked well? What do you think you did that you'd change? First? How did you feel about first?"

After Annie had given a fairly lengthy description of her sense of the class, Carmen said, "Sure. I picked up the same thing when I was observing." She paraphrased what Annie had said and then began to build the scaffold. "I thought we might come up with some ideas on how we're gonna grab 'em and give 'em a reason for what they're going to do. How do you think you might go about that? Getting them excited about what they are going to do?"

She continued with a leading, yes-no question: "Do you think they understood the point other than that they'd get 5 points extra credit? Do you think they understood the reason why they were doing the poetry?" Annie had been unable to recognize what Carmen perceived to be the reason for the problems with the class, so she led her to it.

Then Carmen asked, "What do you think you might do to make them aware?" and Annie had several ideas. Carmen followed with modeling what she might say to the class to get the lesson started on a positive note. Eventually, she very directly told Annie, "We always have a reason for everything we do. I find that you're more successful when you let them in on it."
In that same session, Carmen asked other leading questions such as "Which class did you feel gave you more attention when you were telling them about common errors?" After Annie's brief response, she recast the same question, "In which class did you feel you had more control? First or second?" After Annie responded again, she said, "What I observed was that...." Only after Annie was required to think and think again about the lesson did Carmen give her perspectives (3/3).

A month later, the nature of the interchange between Carmen and Annie started out similarly and then changed. After Carmen's initial open-ended question, Annie was able to talk at length about how lively her second period class was that day. When she finished, Carmen asked a series of leading questions: "What do you think is the cause for their change? What do you think was the thing that got them to start responding? Can you remember what that was? What have you been doing that would make them want to respond?"

Then she switched to following her open-ended questions with extending prompts. For example, she said, "You mentioned that fifth period liked the game and second didn't. What do you think is the difference?" After Annie responded, Carmen probed, "Why?" After another response, "Why do you think that might be?" and later, "Do you want
second to be more like fifth?" Eventually, she asked a leading question: "Different groups, different personalities -- how does that affect your teaching?"

After Annie's response, she praised her, "Different teaching styles, different activities. Good, you've learned my lesson" (4/6).

In the taped sample from their April 21 conference, Carmen began with, "Well, how did it go second period?" and Annie took it from there, doing most of the talking for several minutes. The next time Carmen spoke, it was to comment, "Ah hah! So today you say it was more interesting than yesterday." When Annie finally stopped talking, Carmen followed with a clarifying question, "So what have you discovered that will be helpful to you when you start teaching?" The leading questions had dropped away. She continued to ask "Why?" and "What do you think was the most valuable thing you learned this week?" -- the types of questions that -- if internalized -- could serve Annie into her first year of teaching and beyond.

Carmen's description of Annie's ability to think about her teaching suggests that some of those questions did, indeed, become internalized. Carmen said of her,

She would -- most of the time -- beat me to the punch. She knew immediately, as soon as the class was over, and we had our minute to chat. Most of the time what I had written down -- things to discuss -- were precisely
the things that she immediately would come and be ready to talk about. 

(Interview #4)

Carmen moved from giving fairly direct feedback to a very indirect approach in her work with Annie. By the end of their time together, Annie was taking the lead in their post-observation talk.

**Becoming a Teacher Educator**

During the first year of the Project, Carmen Sparks was aware of her role as a Clinical Faculty member. She also came to be more attuned to herself as a teacher educator.

**Participation in the Clinical Faculty Project**

Carmen believes that teachers need time to talk with colleagues in order to keep from becoming ground down by their work. She talked about the job and its demands.

Because teaching is very difficult. It'll chew you up. It'll spit you out very quickly. It'll use you up. It'll drain you of your energy very quickly. And I think that you constantly have to fight to hang on to the attitude .... You insulate yourself a little bit more, and it doesn't touch you. You don't go home as tired every day. But then, you don't feel as alive. And I think that, in this profession, we need something. And for me that's what [the Project] does -- a challenge and being able to think about teaching. And I think this was precisely what I needed at this time. It's made me feel more -- let's say -- professional, so to speak. It's made me
really be aware of the importance of my job, my work with my students.  
(Interview #2)

For Carmen, the small group sessions with others in foreign language were especially meaningful. She described how the secondary group meetings and the subject-specific sessions worked together for her.

The sessions where we have all the high school Clinical Faculty together are good, and I see that as a springboard perhaps to work in small groups. I find the small group work in our particular subject is most beneficial because that is of course a primary concern to me in my work with the student teacher but in terms of concepts in foreign language. I find that excellent, and would like to continue that. And I find it very good, great, super, that we are getting together also with the student teachers. That's a forum for all involved, and I think that's very good, very healthy. I think it's a function of the size of the group, but I think it's, more important, the topics that we're discussing that's more valuable.  
(Interview #3)

Numerous times in the interviews, Carmen expressed her sense of having been moved to a meta-perspective on her work. She talked of a "new mind set" and a "new level of thinking." She linked the change to her work in the Project.

I think in that respect, my teaching changed this year. My teaching changed -- or at least my whole perception of it -- because I was a part of the Clinical Faculty. That in itself gave me a real shot in the arm. Because...first of all, it came as a big surprise to be select to participate in the
project. And it just made me realize that somewhere along the line, somebody must have thought that my work was good, and, once you have been identified or labeled, you almost have to prove it -- live up to that, to that label. (Interview #4)

Carmen also described an increased sense of her accountability as a teacher because of the new sense of professionalism.

I think it made me probably look more at myself, my own teaching. And, it certainly has had a profound influence even on my teaching. I mean that it's given me, uh, new things to think about -- to think about what is actually happening in my classroom. I'm more conscience of what happens in my classroom, and I think that even at times when students get chatty or something and I feel like, I feel guilty. I feel more guilty than I did before. And uh, I think that, uh, I don't know it's just made me sit up and take notice of my own classroom a lot more than I had. (Interview #2)

Though Carmen had long been a teacher who looked to improve, one who was, in her words, "constantly changing," she admitted that prior to being selected for participation in the project, she was in jeopardy of becoming one of those teachers who are on "automatic pilot." She gave a heavy sigh and continued talking about her sense of having risen to a new perspective.

Because it's taken me out of the, let's say, 'faculty lounge mentality.' What I mean by that, is teachers sitting around and just talking about how miserable everything is. And that happens. You transcend. I know this sounds bizarre and weird, but it's almost as if you transcend that level, and
you're not thinking about students and you're not thinking about your classroom in that type of situation or feeling, but rather you go above that and you see how important it is -- what you're doing, and how you do it. I know that probably doesn't make any sense, but I, it's been a totally very uplifting experience for me. It's opened my eyes to help me, in fact, work on some new ideas and new things for my students. (Interview #2)

In contrast to the energy-depleting talk of the faculty lounge, her talk in the Project was energy-producing.

It has been a nice, almost slap across the face that's "Wake up!" and I feel more energized. I feel more alive. I feel like I'm trying to really put my finger on what skills, what things are important for my students to have -- the legacy that I want to pass on to them. Yes, it came from the others in the meeting. Uh, just the idea of working in the groups together where we had teachers that taught in elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, and the fact that they were from different schools was very refreshing, because it was never on a level of "So-an-so, he's just awful," and I mean, you know, it's beyond that level and you're talking about students. You're talking about how they learn, and you find that all the common threads that basically, the elementary students are not radically different from middle school students who are not radically different from high school students the needs of children. (Interview #2)

Carmen credited the Phase I mixed group sessions with stimulating that response.
An Increase in Efficacy as a Teacher Educator

As Carmen moved through the second semester of the Project year, meeting with her foreign language and other secondary colleagues, her identity as a teacher educator became more salient for her. One indicator of her sense of self-efficacy was that she began to give suggestions for the Allegheny State teacher education program to the university foreign language specialist.

In the early March meeting, Carmen explained that she was concerned that Spanish student teachers were expected by the university supervisor to give directions in Spanish rather than in English.

I probably stand out in the wind alone on giving directions to students in a foreign language. I know the ideal is to do everything -- as much as you can -- in the foreign language. But my personal philosophy is that I give my directions in English. I do that because I want to be as efficient as possible -- and, I don't think that 'Escribe en Espanol, clase' is something that would come up with a native."

We need to examine our objective. What do we want the learners to learn?

(Foreign Language Session 3/6)

At the end of that session, Carmen suggested that the "colleges take a look at seeking out high school teachers to come to assist them in teaching the foreign language methods classes." She also proposed a teaching exchange program between the university and the high school. She told the
foreign language specialist from State, "My concern in
general as a high school foreign language teacher is that it
is a shame that we don't have more dialogue between the high
school and the college. What are your expectations? We
need to address that and work together."

The next time we talked, Carmen told me about some of
the ideas that had come out of that small group meeting.

As a result of our conversations in the small
group, in the subject area groups, one of the
concerns that Annie mentioned was the fact
that it had been a long time since she had
looked at grammar. She'd been spending most
of her time in college looking at literature
and was faced now with the fact now of
teaching grammar. So as a result, and that
she felt a little bit uneasy in that respect
-- and that was the hardest thing to do -- to
learn how to teach the grammar. From that
talk, we have been working together more on
reviewing a particular grammar point before
she teaches it and then actually talking
about suggested ways we might deliver the
grammar. I never thought about it, but as a
result of that we discussed the fact that we
might need to make some adjustments in the
methods classes on the college level that
they might have before student teaching.
Here's even a new idea, the creation of a
grammar course for teachers. Actually
changing the college curriculum.

(Interview #3)

As Carmen became more sensitive to her student
teacher's perspectives, more intentional in her work with
Annie, and more aware of learning to teach as a
developmental process, Carmen came to view herself more as a
professional educator and as a professional teacher educator.

This year it was more of what I call 'a turnkey job,' and that means it was more professional, more professional -- the give-and-take relationship -- to where I even viewed the student teacher through different eyes, more in terms of trying to be an equal rather than just some little student who is coming in here to do some practice teaching and I can teach her or him a few things -- a much different attitude. (Interview #4)

Carmen's newfound sense of professionalism was manifested in her completion of the notebook where she had recorded her observations of Annie over the course of their time and her gift of that notebook to Annie on their last day together.

I left the first few pages blank -- I don't know why I did that -- when I set up the notebook, but I found out that they came in very handy because along the way with the notebook I finished the product by taking photographs of the school, the classroom and each one of the classes of students. I had them all line up in a group, and I made a page for each class with each student's name in English and in Spanish, to identify them in the photograph. I had left enough pages in the front of the booklet, and I put the pictures in there. I put a new cover on the book, and that was what I gave her yesterday as her departure gift. I titled the outside of it, "My Student Teaching Diary." I have never done that in the past. (Interview #4)

Carmen's sense of the changes in her self-efficacy were apparent when she contrasted the job she did this year with her work as a cooperating teacher in the past. She
attributed the differences to the meta-perspective she was coming to have on her work. In mid-February, she said,

Probably, if I had been left on my own, and it would have been another circumstance of no Clinical Faculty and a student teacher coming on board, probably things would have been very much like they were in the past and handled like they were in the past. But the Project has given me the opportunity to look at it from a different viewpoint, to actually step out of myself and look, look in. In other words it's allowed me to distance myself and to work on a different level. And I think we need that because that's probably the thing that in education is the most difficult thing to do -- to find the time to stand back and look and observe, and particularly observe one's self.

(Interview #2)

She thought about those differences again at the end of Annie's time with her. In early May, Carmen said,

In the past I think when working with a student teacher, the student teacher appeared at my door. I had to deal with things, and I never really had much thought about the process. I just knew that, well, he or she has been assigned, and we will do this, and we will get through it. Hopefully, I will create somewhat of a little clone. But involvement with Clinical Faculty kinda blew that theory sky high -- by having to look at our own teaching and to think about how it feels to actually work in front of a classroom, working with the students, and all of the things that we do and take for granted on a daily basis.

(Interview #4)

After she had listened to the tape of samples of her talk with Annie, she summed up her sense of improved efficacy as a teacher educator. She wrote, "I feel that I
am getting better at discussing what happened in the classroom with a student teacher" (Tape Notes 6/1).

Conclusion

Carmen Sparks had a very positive experience in the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project during the 1988-1989 school year. The early Project tasks, especially the "Thinking about Teaching" task, appear to have dislodged her from what she described as the early stages of going on "autopilot" as a teacher. Stimulated by talk about teaching with colleagues from all grades and subjects, but especially from her own subject area, Carmen moved to a "new level" of thinking about her work with her students and with her student teacher.

From the beginning, she approached Annie as a mentor interested in helping her through the developmental process of learning to teach, and also as a colleague from whom she could learn. In her work with Annie, she was more sensitive and more intentional than she had been with previous student teachers.

Carmen developed strategies for giving feedback to Annie that were designed to separate classroom events from value judgments about those events. In so doing, she was able to foster Annie's ability to think about and to make
decisions about her teaching. Finally, involvement in the Project appears to be related to her increasing sense of efficacy in her own ability to work the teaching show as well as the teacher educator show.

The Case of Donna Matthews

Donna Matthews teaches Algebra I, Algebra II, Algebra-Trig, and Advanced Algebra at Sparta High School, where she also serves as Chair of the Mathematics Department. Her total number of years of teaching experience is 22.

Professional Biography of Donna Matthews

Donna Matthews knew at a very young age that she wanted to teach. She saw in her elementary and high school teachers qualities she wanted to emulate. After student teaching at her own high school with a kind, understanding cooperating teacher with whom she is still good friends, Donna got her first teaching job through a business acquaintance of her father's. Her first two years were very difficult, perhaps partly due to her pursuit of a graduate degree during that time. Since those first two years, teaching has been more enjoyable for her.

Donna has worked with approximately one student teacher per year for the past 20 years. Most of the beginners under
her supervision have come from Allegheny State University. A few have been students at a four-year liberal arts college located in the city of Sparta.

Donna Matthews is not certain why she was selected for participation in the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project, but she believes she was chosen for the Project by her building principal. Because she is department chair and has 3 planning periods, she thinks she may be perceived to have more time for working with a beginner. She also thinks that her years of teaching experience and previous work with student teachers were factors in her selection.

**Donna Matthews on Teaching and Learning**

Donna Matthews believes that open communication is important in the teaching and learning process and in the relationship between herself and her student teacher. The first time Project participants were asked to list those qualities they thought were important to being an effective cooperating teacher, she wrote "communicative." The first time we talked, I asked Donna to tell me about her sense of her strengths as a teacher. She responded by defining what it is to her to be a teacher.

I've always been aware that a teacher has to be a good communicator. What I know I simply want my students to know, but this business
of getting it from my head to theirs is what teaching is all about. So, this business of communication is very important. I define a teacher as a better than average communicator. This business of open lines of communication.... That's an objective I have when I'm working with students and it certainly is an objective when I work with student teachers. So, the parallel, the likeness, is probably this trying to develop some kind of communication. You tell me what you know and I'll tell you what I know, and we will agree, tactfully to tell one another if we think one another is wrong. And then, we'll go from there. (Interview #1)

In the other interviews, she often referred directly or indirectly to the importance of communication and often indicated that she believed she and Kelly were communicating very well. In the small group math session February 8, she told how she and her student teacher had a chance to get to know each other on the first day because the school was on Exam Schedule. They went out to lunch together, and Donna had a chance to take Kelly on a tour of her husband's business near the restaurant where they ate. On May 24 at the final Project session for 1988-1989, when asked to list qualities of a good Clinical Faculty member, Donna included "listening" in her initial brainstormed list. For her, open communication had remained an important part of working with a student teacher.

Donna likes teaching and her subject matter very much. She believes that liking math is important both to teaching
and to learning it effectively. Her enthusiasm was apparent when I observed her in the classroom as well as when she talked to me about teaching.

I felt good about the lesson yesterday because.... Have you ever taught and then after you just find yourself breathing hard and you know you've worked up to something and you know everybody out there listening was as excited about it as you were? That's the way I felt when it was over with yesterday. Even though they didn't have any homework, 'cause I haven't finished the topic, but ... their body language indicated -- they were facing me -- they were involved in what I was doing and they were calling out answers but it wasn't rude or loud or anything. I think it's because I knew that the students were as involved as I was. I mean I was tired when it was over. Have you ever felt that way? And, it was just a good experience. You know, you like to have those every day, but, you just can't. They knew that I thought it was difficult and we just went from there. It was just a good exchange.  

(Interview #1)

On May 24, she rated "Likes to teach" as the third most important quality of an effective Clinical Faculty member, behind only "Wants to work with a student teacher" and "Is a good teacher."

Donna Matthews believes she can learn about teaching through collecting and interpreting data, by working with her student teacher, by participating in inservice projects, and by thinking about her teaching. She brings a great deal of energy to her work. On February 3, she told me,

I feel like these student teachers have a lot to teach me. You know, they are still in
college. They should know what the latest things are, and they truly do help me a great deal. And I find out each school year, if I don't have a school project like this one to keep me going, it is kinda dull. You know sometimes it's self-study, and sometimes I go away on school evaluations. Now this is the Clinical Faculty project and then, there is always something. I think it is good for me. It really is. (Interview #1)

One of the first things she had her student teacher do this year was to construct a sociogram of the class interaction as she observed. They talked about the data together, and Donna asked Kelly what she would recommend that she do about the students' writing letters during class time.

We talked about a sociogram and I suggested she just use the seating chart and take arrows and start with the student who initiated the conversation and draw an arrow to the focus of his discussion. And if she could hear it, just kind of make a little note about what the discussion was all about. And we had a really nice talk about that Tuesday afternoon which I recorded. As a result of her notes, I changed the seating arrangement in two classes the next day. (Interview #2)

Early on in the student teaching term, Donna was able to show Kelly a way to collect and interpret information about classroom interaction. The idea was one she had gotten from the first math session. (2/8)

Donna believes that teachers must set high expectations for their students, and that the students will live up to
them. In talking about lazy upper level students with Kelly on February 14, Donna said, "They have to figure out that they are graded on achievement, not on their ability" (Taped Conference).

In Donna's classroom, students are expected to develop self-discipline. Although she allows students to respond without being acknowledged by her, they do so in an orderly manner. She sees good classroom discipline as one of her strengths as a teacher and believes that she should give positive reinforcement for correct responses. In describing the written classroom case during Phase I on October 28, Donna noted that the children in the class spoke without being called upon and that the teacher gave affirmation to students who were correct. She also noted that students were verbalizing freely in her own classroom when she listened to the tape she made for Analysis Task 2. The first time we talked, she explained,

I have good crowd control. Uh, at the same time I hope that my students feel like that they have the freedom to speak out. They don't have to raise their hands in my class to make a comment or to give an answer or anything like that, but I hope they understand -- and I think they do -- that as long as they are courteous and are good listeners to their classmates as well as to me, then they can express an opinion when they want to as long as it's done in an orderly fashion. And given the number of students I deal with each class period, this philosophy and this practice has brought me through 22 years of teaching. But in
comparison with a lot of people I teach next
door to, I'm sure it all comes across as
pretty army-like, but uh, I cope with things
better when they're pretty straight. I have
good students. It didn't start out in
September like that, but now they are. They
are very good, very good, very involved
students. When somebody says something
that's correct in my class I usually point to
them and say, "That's right," uh, I try to
take every opportunity and say "That's good.
That's right," or "I like the way you said
that". (Interview #1)

When I observed her classroom, I saw that the students
were orderly and responsive to her teaching, and that the
scene was much as she described it above. By March 7 she
was telling the other members of the math small group, "We
are deeply into classroom management." In a conference with
Kelly on March 27, Donna assured her that her preparation
for teaching and her lessons were fine, but that their main
concern was classroom management. On April 5, she told her,
"You have to be a disciplinarian."

In general, Donna responds positively to authority,
going along with the wishes of her superordinates unless she
has a specific objection. She thinks that others ought to
do the same.

Anybody who gets into teaching and thinks
that it's a hourly contract, you know, should
look elsewhere. And that type of attitude
puzzles me about other people who choose
careers, too. That they choose a career
which is virtually is your lifestyle after
you make that choice. And then they start to
pick and choose what aspects of it they are
going to do. Uh, it's, I don't quite go
along with that attitude. At times I don't think the employee, that is the teacher and/or the student teacher has any right to, say, get a memo from their supervisor or the principal and say "I don't think I should do this." My attitude is, if my principal asks me to do it, and it's reasonable, then we should do it. I don't think we should, we don't have a right to question it. If I have to stay a little late to get it done, then that's the way it should be. It's like extra meetings, working on other committees, sponsoring club. That's all part of the contract. (Interview #1)

In a later interview, she indicated that math teachers are not free to make decisions about curriculum, but rather they must teach the content assigned to them to teach. In the math small group session of February 8, she explained the procedure whereby teaching teams in her math department make decisions together about math curriculum and give common exams. On March 7, she told the members of the math small group that they follow the state curriculum very closely in the subjects for which the assessments have been created but not so closely in the others. She explained their actions in terms of "state mandates" and how closely they are "watching you."

As we moved through the first year of the Project, Donna's frustration with the environment of school became more apparent. In my interviews with her and in project sessions, she repeatedly described her work as fragmented
and her work place as a hectic environment where she is frequently interrupted.

Teaching is a lifestyle. And I have a lot of visitors all day long. I'm interrupted by students and phone calls and teachers asking me things. I'll start a conversation with her, and then we're interrupted. My sense of this Clinical Faculty Project is to just to be so organized and have it all together, just kind of be on a tidy little schedule. The realistic part of this is -- this is the way it is. These interruptions, the bells ringing, the announcements being made, people interrupting me, class being interrupted for fire drills -- whatever. I don't want to come across to somebody that's really frazzled most of the time. Sometimes in the afternoon I go home, and I think my hair's just standing out from having dealt with everything that goes on during the day. So I don't want this to be, I don't want to appear to be overwhelmed or too busy to talk with her, but I've gone home in the afternoons feeling that way. That's a very real part of teaching. It's not a calm job.

(Interview #1)

Differences between her sense of what was expected of her by those whom she perceived to be her superordinates in the Project and her sense of the location where she was to perform those behaviors with her student teacher caused her to be increasingly anxious about whether she was doing what she was supposed to do. Despite her uneasiness with some aspects of the Project, however, Donna responded very positively to most of the suggestions from Project leaders and her other colleagues during the Phase II discussion sessions.
Donna Matthews and the Clinical Faculty Project

Donna Matthews found connections between various Project discussions and tasks and her work as both a teacher and a teacher educator.

The Project Discussion Sessions

Donna was able to make direct links between three of the topics treated in Phase II and her ensuing work with Kelly. She recognized that this year she (1) was more sensitive to her student teacher; (2) conducted her orientation with more intentionality; and (3) approached the student teaching experience more as a developmental process than she had in the past.

Sensitivity to Needs and Perspectives. During the first large group secondary session of Phase II, participants were asked to recall their own student teaching experience and then to list implications those memories had for their work as cooperating teachers. Donna tied the "Remembering Student Teaching" activity (Secondary Session 1/11) to her becoming more sensitive to the needs and perspectives of her student teacher this year.

Did we have one workshop on thinking about our own student teaching experiences and what we would change and what we would like to see take place again? I think a lot of it came out of that. I really do, because it kinda
sets the tone for how you feel about young people, and how you feel about teaching.

(Interview #4)

In addition to her own memories of having struggled early in her own career, Donna heard the horror stories of colleagues during the secondary meeting on January 11 and again in one of the small group meetings (Math Session 3/7). The sharing also included lots of talk about what the Project participants were doing differently this year to make their student teachers more comfortable.

Although Donna would not characterize herself as having been insensitive to student teachers in the past, she is aware that this year has been different, that she has been more nurturing.

I did make an effort to be mothering more or less, because I thought that was important. Because I think student teaching can be a terrifying experience. Some [student teachers] can be mothered just more naturally than others, but, I don't remember spending as much time with them, as I spent with Kelly.

(Interview #4)

In her final taped conference with Kelly, Donna asked, "How is your work load? Is it too much?" On May 24, in addition to "Listening," Donna wrote, "Knows what it's like to be a student teacher" when asked to list qualities important to being a good Clinical Faculty member.

Planned, Intentional Orientation. Donna was aware that she became more intentional in her orientation of this
student teacher after sharing ideas for induction with colleagues (Secondary Session 1/18) and as a result of thinking about her own student teaching.

I made sure that she has a place to sit, a place to call her own in the office. The other student teacher has to share his supervising teacher's desk, but he's not in this program. It hasn't been a lot of subject matter orientation which -- I'm doing that on purpose. I don't want to overwhelm her with the Algebra right here in the beginning. I just want her to try to fit in. Having thought about my own student teaching experience, I remember that during the first couple weeks I just felt like I was in the way -- you know -- that I was bothering the people that were supposed to be supervising me, and so yesterday I started feeling that with Kelly. (Interview #2)

In that January session, one of the Project members suggested that what was needed was a "lesson plan" for the student teacher's arrival at the school. As did most of the secondary Clinical Faculty members, Donna developed a plan for this year's student teacher's first few days in the school. One of the first things she had Kelly do was to write answers to specific questions about the school, policies, and procedures. The idea came from one of her colleagues at Sparta during the large group sharing on January 18.

You know I haven't done a lot of different things with her, uh, other than deliberately planning for her arrival, making sure that she is aware of my long-term objectives in classes. I have not been very concerned about getting her started teaching at the end
of the first week. That is less a concern now than it has been in the past. In the past, they showed up on that day -- no earlier, no introductory visit. It was right on the first day. They just followed me to class; they just followed me around, and if I had an extra textbook I'd place it on their desk and they just sat and watched me that day. Well, it's true I have done a lot of thinking about this student teacher before she came. In times past, you really don't get your ducks in a row until the day they arrive. (Interview #2)

At the next small group meeting of the math teachers, Donna reported, "Knowing she was coming, I planned it. I 'neatened up' my seating chart. I didn't give her a lot of written stuff, not a lot of stuff that's too much" (Math Session 2/8). She was very careful to make sure that Kelly was given new tasks at a rate at which she could manage them.

I knew the first couple days I just wanted her to observe and I had one plan for her second day and that was to observe student interaction and make some notes. And then yesterday she continued to do that and started giving out papers for me, and I also gave her a grade book and a planning book and she copied my rolls and the grade the kids are in and so forth. So I gave her more of that type of thing to do. Today she's supposed to continue that plus conduct a little hands-on activity in Algebra I. (Interview #2)

Donna had heard a great deal of talk about planning for the student teacher's arrival and conducting an organized orientation. Her sensitivity to the student teacher's needs
and perspectives increased following the "Remembering Student Teaching" activity. Thus, Donna, like many of her colleagues in the secondary section of the Project, often voiced the belief that it is very important not to overwhelm the student teacher early in the experience.

Having done more planning and more thinking about their arrival, and..., I just don't want her to start teaching as soon as the others have. The orientation period is extremely important. (Interview #2)

When she told about how she coached Kelly between classes, Donna said, "I just don't want to scare her by giving her a lot of..." (Interview #3). As she talked about the planned induction, Donna went on to suggest her sense of Kelly's stage of development early on. She said,

I just don't want to overwhelm her with the Algebra here in the beginning. She was told to learn student names, and yesterday she had specific instructions to take the roll for me—which is a matter of checking admit slips and marking the students who were absent. That was her responsibility entirely yesterday. I think Kelly is at the material level of things. Getting in the right number of hours, getting up and getting here on time, looking the role of a teacher, having those physical maneuvers that make you look like a teacher. (Interview #2)

In the January 18 large group meeting, the discussion had been turned from orientation strategies to beginning to look at where the student teachers are in their development and where they should be by half way through the experience.
Student Teaching as a Developmental Process. As the discussions in the larger secondary (2/22) and the smaller math (3/7) Project meetings focused increasingly on looking at where the student were developmentally and what should be the role of the Clinical Faculty member in response to those changes, Donna's language revealed an increasing awareness that student teachers experience growth over time.

I'm more concerned with long range goals -- longer range goals. I'm aware of long range goals. I think of those things when I'm talking with her. It could be the effect of this being a progressive grading experience. It's not going to be arithmetic average. Her grade is not going to be an average. It's going to be a progressive type thing. What she's doing at the end of it all and how she's dealing with students and the subject matter is going to be more important as it goes on here, than in between time. I have a new attitude about that. Uh, it's not a completely new attitude. It's always been kind of progressive experience, this business of student teaching, but working with Kelly, it's more developmental than it's ever been before. And I can't quite describe it, but my attitude is different. I've always liked to work with the student teacher. I just don't think I've taken this much time to think about it before. (Interview #2)

In that math session, Donna used phrases that suggested her newfound awareness of student teaching as a developmental process. She said, "She's over that threshold where...," and "We're at that point...." She also heard a colleague describe learning to teach as analogous to
learning to drive a car in that the beginner has to focus on so much that is automatic to an experienced teacher. The next time we talked, Donna told me,

I think that, as far as connections are concerned, [talk with other math Clinical Faculty members in the small group sessions] is very helpful in that, I think that my student teacher is pretty much the same stage of development as their student teachers are, and that was very helpful. I have liked that, and we have also talked about what we expect next... that certainly people are different, and that these student teachers will respond to different things, in different orders and at different rates. Basically, it is a great support group for kind of sounding out what we are trying to do when, what we expect next, and what has happened so far -- maybe some suggestions on what to pass along to these young people and how to deal with the classroom management, and the clerical tasks and so forth. (Interview #3)

Although the large group agenda for March 22 included the sharing of different forms of written feedback, in their small group meeting on April 5, the math teachers continued their discussion of developmental stages. They talked at length about where their student teachers were and where they should be at that time. Donna participated in that discussion when it turned to consideration of when the student teacher should be left alone, indicating, "I've already left mine alone" (Math Session 4/5).
Later, Donna noted that Kelly had undergone a marked change at one point in the process of developing as a teacher.

I have the date upstairs in my journal when the transition occurred. It was a morning. I was sitting at my desk and she was sitting at hers, and one of our mutual students came in, went right past me over to her desk and I.... She knew she was the teacher then, and so, uh at that point when she -- it must have been 5 or 6 weeks into her teaching -- she now had assumed full responsibility for the classes, and uh, we could work together instead of her working for me.

(Interview #4)

Donna also is aware that her role changes over time.

In the last interview, she told me:

I, we...try to have a sharing experience, a mutual agreement on the policies that we enforce in the classroom -- here in the second half of her student teaching -- without saying, "This is what I have done, now you do the same thing."

Considering all of the evidence that Donna has come to believe that student teachers develop at different rates and that the cooperating teacher's role changes in response to the beginner's development, it is surprising that Donna indicated at the final session on May 24 that she would like to have "a 'calendar' of activities for student teaching -- how long should they observe, when to let them take charge of a class, etc" (Final Session 5/24).
Other Project members continued to voice a desire to shape what they were learning into a handbook for cooperating teachers that would include checklists, role definitions, and other suggestions for working with the beginner. Perhaps Donna's indication of a need for a calendar reflected her interest in such a document rather than specifically a need for a fixed time line of what to do when. Or, perhaps it was an indication that she finished the first year of the Project needing less ambiguity and more definition in her work as a teacher educator.

The Thinking about Teaching Task

Although Donna responded to much of the early Phase II discussion very positively as evidenced by her becoming more sensitive to the needs and perspectives of her student teacher, more intentional in her work with Kelly, and more aware of the student teaching experience as developmental, her response to one of the Phase I Tasks became increasingly problematical and eventually may have caused her to lose enthusiasm for the Project by mid-March.

Differentiating Observations and Judgments. That the "Thinking about Teaching" task (Observations and Judgments) of Phase I had an impact on Donna's awareness of distinctions between the two terms is established in her
talk with her student teacher and in the texts of the interviews. In talking with Kelly, Donna made comments such as, "That's not a criticism; it's just an observation" and "That is just my opinion." In the third interview, she said, "I am very conscious about making judgment about Kelly's teaching, and more so than I have ever been before" (Interview #3).

It also seems that she had inferred from that task that it was the intention of the Project leaders to suggest that giving judgments of another's teaching is negative and always to be avoided. On her work sheet for that task, Donna had listed every phrase from her description of the lesson on Columbus (See Appendix -- Phase I Tasks) under the "Judgments" heading. On November 2 when the Project participants all were asked if they had any comments about their involvement in the Project that they would like to share at that time, Donna wrote, "I'm more conscious of what I'm doing in the classroom. I tend to be judgmental."

Perhaps her inference that judging is to be avoided led her to the following reasoning: "Judgment is wrong. I'm judgmental. Therefore, I need to change my approach so as to avoid judging." In order to see how such logic affected her work with Kelly, it is necessary to look at her approach to supervision across time.
A Chronology of Donna's Frustration. In the Math Session on February 8, Donna was still generally very positive toward the Project and toward her work with her student teacher. She was, however, beginning to feel some discomfort with what she perceived was expected of her.

It's really hard not to be a boss in this situation. I hadn't done that with other student teachers. It just really didn't seem important, but this time, I'm approaching it a little differently. (Math Session 2/8)

Later in that same session, she shared her discomfort with indirect supervision strategies as she had experienced them.

My administrator -- when I was called in for my evaluation last year -- did just what you said. He just read off what I did and waited. That kind of bugs me a little bit because I remember what I did, and I want to know where I stand, you see. There's this change going on in the administration. And I know what they're doing, but I would personally would like this person to say you did this and I liked it, but I didn't like that. Or why did you do it?" (Math Session 2/8)

At my request, Donna began taping samples of her talk with Kelly on February 14. In her first taped conference, Donna used an indirect approach in asking Kelly to talk about the sociogram she had constructed as she observed Donna's class that day. Donna listened, raised questions that extended Kelly's report on her perspectives on the class, and asked Kelly for a recommendation of what to do
about changing the seating location of one student.

Two days later when I talked with Donna, she was very frustrated with her perceived expectation that she use an indirect approach to supervision given the constraints of the pace of the school day and its hectic environment.

This business of reflection being a part of the Project. I agree with that, and I think it's necessary to the Project, and I certainly think that all teachers should take time to do that. But in our discussions on Wednesday afternoon, in our Clinical Faculty groups, it is not the neat and tidy little philosophical little reflections and philosophical thinking out sections that we discuss at other times. It is fast; it's hectic; it's not being conducted in a textbook type of manner. (Interview #2)

My response to her was less than satisfactory at the time. I said to her, "I'm hearing you say that the real world -- the real world of school -- is a place where people do not have time for reflection. It's important for you to say that, but now, how can I get back to my agenda?" (Interview #2). In retrospect, I believe it is a clear example of how my roles in the Project often were in conflict. Her perception of me was that I was one of the leaders of the Project. During the interview, I was intent on operating as a researcher. I was there to record her perceptions, not to affect them -- and certainly not to attempt to clarify them.
She continued to try to get her message across to me, however. Throughout that interview, there were other references to her frustration with frequent interruptions during school hours. She expressed her concern about finding time to talk with Kelly, despite being Department Chair and having three planning periods. She said, "That's just the way it is, teaching, when you are surrounded by 1100 students and eleven teachers."

At the next large group session, Donna appeared very tired and distracted. When I asked her what was wrong, she indicated that she had been through a difficult department meeting prior to coming to the 4:00 session and that she was just tired. Even so, I left that meeting with an uneasy feeling that our communication was not what I wanted it to be. In retrospect, I wonder how much of the discussion she processed effectively that day, whatever the reason.

The agenda included discussion of the different orientation strategies that people had used. Then we began talking about developmental stages. Near the end, several members agreed that their student teachers wanted direct feedback early on, that they wanted to know where they stood. Others cautioned that too much specific detail could be overwhelming. For the most part Project leaders kept out of the discussion.
It was a good exchange -- one in which there was general consensus that some direct feedback is essential to student teachers, especially early in the experience. It was also a discussion that kept to the collaborative spirit on the Project. At one point, a faculty member from State said, "But we do want to get them past telling them to the 'what do you think?'" There was, however, no one from higher education telling the cooperating teachers that they should sit back and expect the student teachers to solve all of their own problems.

When she met with the other math teachers on March 7, Donna's first comment suggested her concern that she be working as a colleague with Kelly: "And so I've...we've begun working with that." After hearing several of her colleagues tell anecdotes about times when they had to be very direct, Donna talked about how it frustrated her that Kelly would not get to the classroom ahead of her students.

I thought it was obvious that she should know that. And also, they should be in a class early. I had to tell her. "You get there first. You be there when they get there. It helps your discipline."

(Math Session 3/7)

Near the end of that session, Donna voiced her concerns about not being able to do what she perceived was expected of her in the Project.
Being in this Project and thinking about the activities that we did last fall. Things are not working out in the tidy little... activities we thought about in the fall, like this week we will work on classroom management, and next week we're gonna add grammar and presentation techniques, and then the third week, we're gonna get you to make up your own math problems. It's not working out. It's not tidy at all... as far as the Project is concerned. There are a lot of loose edges floating around everywhere. 

(Math Session 3/7)

The math education specialist from State asked her, "What makes it like that?" and she continued,

It's just the nature of the job. We can sit in these study groups and have these great conversations on Wednesday.... What's today? On Tuesday afternoon, and without experience we can say, "These are the things we should work on." But the facts of life are, once you walk into that school building, it's everything at once. And it is difficult to focus on improving in one area at a time. And I think the student teacher needs to know this. And it sounds like they have.... There are so many things going on at once that you have to deliberately focus on one and deal with everything else at the same time. 

(Math Session 3/7)

When asked to articulate what was causing her concerns, Donna went back to her frustration with the hectic nature of the school environment. Perhaps because she experienced anxiety last fall over her new awareness that she tends to be judgmental and has more recently experienced anxiety over finding it difficult to separate tasks for the beginner to
learn, she conflated the two experiences and said that they focused on separating tasks last fall. In fact, as noted above, the planned induction and attempting to look at student teaching more systematically were discussion topics in the January sessions.

Although she had heard several discussions by then that had focused on the importance of giving lots of direct feedback -- especially early on -- and then moving to less direct supervision strategies, in her taped conference of March 14, Donna began with very open-ended questions. She asked, "What do think of 5th and 6th?"; "How about your attendance?"; "What do you think about the pace of the class?"; "What is your major concern at this point?"; and "Do you plan to do anything differently?" From time to time she gave direct advice (e.g. "Check homework"; "Give quizzes"), but mostly she let Kelly talk. Near the end, it was clear that Donna was struggling to be indirect, to do what she thought was expected of her by the leaders of the Project, perhaps especially by the one who was going to listen to the tape (i.e. by me).

In our final interview on May 1, Donna admitted that the talk on the tape was not representative of the day-to-day interchanges between the two of them. She said, "The last three times that I taped, well.... It just seemed so
set up; it just got to be too formal. It wasn't like the conversations we were having during the school day." By then, however, she had come to a better understanding of what was and what was not the intention and expectation of Project leaders.

When we talked the day after she had done that taping, all of the frustration came pouring out. I asked if she could make any connection between her experience of working with her student teacher this year and having thought about observations and judgments last October. Her response was immediate and it was lengthy. It was also very telling.

Yes, I am very conscious of making judgment about Kelly's teaching, and more so than I have ever been before. I was aware in the past that when I said things like, "You speak well in front of a group, or you have a good rapport with a class." I knew that was a judgment, but now I, I am much more aware of those things. However, I find that in my own experience that when I am being evaluated, and now after working with Kelly for about four weeks, I want -- and she wants -- an opinion. Uh, I think she respects my experience in the classroom, and uh, she wants to know how I think she is doing compared to how I see other people teach. So, I am aware of the subjective nature of certain evaluation forms, uh, but what I learned, and how I learn to distinguish between objective and even subjective evaluations, uh ...I am still doing subjective evaluations. I haven't changed. I tried, and I also tried talking with Kelly. This business of reflecting on her teaching, and getting her to draw out what she thought she was doing well, or poorly or whatever. Number one -- it took too much time. We didn't have that much time to spend in some
lengthy conversation, whereby she kinda sorta sorted through what went on in the classroom. It took just too much time for her to come around. Given the time that we have during the day. Uh, so, uh .... She, she basically wants to know what she is doing well, and what she is doing poorly, and that is basically where it is at. I told her -- described to her what type of training I went to last fall, and my goals, and what I am trying to do in this Project. And I am just up front with her, and uh, she is very cooperative and so forth, but she is still wants to know, "What do you think?" you know, "What is the quality of my work at this point?" And I, I told her that I can sit at the back of the room and count how many times she calls on boys now and how many times she calls on girls. I can do objective tallies of what is going on. We talk more in terms of her rapport, motivation, and how the students are responding to her and that type of thing. Things that are not objective. So, uh, as far as my training from last fall is concerned.... My awareness is there, but I found that it is almost impossible to implement a completely objective observation. (Interview #3)

When Donna had raised this concern before, I had attempted to respond as a researcher. This time I responded as a Project leader: "One of the points that we tried to make with that task was that while it is important to be able to differentiate which we are doing. We didn't want to suggest that judgments are necessarily negative, or a negative thing to do." Then, I changed the subject back to focusing on her sense of Kelly's growth over time. She did not appear to be visibly upset, but she clearly had wanted
to get the concern out into the open with me.

Later in that interview, she brought up the topic again.

I just think that this business of asking a young student teacher to reflect on what they have done has been impossible. I think that reflect -- that it must be a graduate term, or a term that only more experienced people can, can do. Uh, I just don't think a student teacher has enough experience, knows teaching to the extent that they have any thing to compare. They just don't. This is their first experience. (Interview #3)

She went on to describe how she had tried to be completely indirect with Kelly at first and how she had to shift to being direct. Note that she indicated that she was doing what she thought was the expectation.

Our conversations where I've tried to be patient and let her come up with her own conclusions on how she can improve and change, I just think have been fruitless. That just hasn't produced anything. I just have to end up telling her what I want her to do, and she does it. She follows through well. It is not something that she has ...they are not conclusions that she has come to herself. Which is what I thought that, maybe, we should be doing. (Interview #3)

Once again I attempted to clarify the intentions of the Project leaders.

Researcher: One of the things that we are trying to do in the Project is work together -- people from the colleges and from the high schools -- work together to try to figure out what is the best way to work with a student teacher in our respective roles. I am hearing you say that you are discovering that being very non-direct is not helpful --
early on at least. I am hearing people from the University and myself say that we want to move people to where they can think about their own teaching. (Interview #3)

Donna did not attend the next large group session. She was out of town on a school evaluation trip. At that meeting, we began by discussing some of the insights that appeared to be emerging from our work together. One was that we were moving from very direct, specific feedback, to less direct feedback and then to indirect strategies. I said that one of the math teachers had told me that she when she suspended judgment, her student teacher became very uncomfortable.

The math education specialist said that she had talked the day before with Donna's student teacher who had reported, "I just don't think this Clinical Faculty thing is working. I need feedback. I want concrete examples of what I'm doing well and poorly. For my teacher to just sit there and look at me expecting me to reflect back on my class...." The math education specialist indicated there was concurrence among her student teachers.

Although Donna did not hear that exchange at the March large group meeting, it is possible that some account of it did get back to her. In any event, in her next taped conference on April 5, she had listed activities Kelly had
done as a stimulus for their talk as she went over them. The strategy was one she had heard from a colleague. Once she said, "That's not a criticism." In addition to various affirmations of Kelly's teaching strategies, Donna gave quite a lot of direct advice, especially about decisions Kelly would have to make in her own classroom.

Because Donna missed the large group session on April 26, I had no contact with her until May 1 when I went to Sparta for our final interview. By then, Kelly was nearly finished, and Donna was able to look at her work with this student teacher in retrospect. She described the frustration of sitting and waiting for Kelly to figure out what she needed to do in her teaching.

I found when we first got started working together, I was still almost her teacher. And uh, I was trying to get her to reflect -- to use some of those graduate terms I have picked up here in the Project -- and she didn't have anything to reflect on. She wanted to know, "Yes, this is right." "Don't do this." She wanted objective things. She wanted to know was she doing things right, or was she doing things wrong. And so, I just gave up on the reflection business. And but I did put her through .... I just .... We sat. The first part of the student teaching experience, she just wanted ... and I felt like she just wanted ... just .... She wanted feedback in terms if she was doing things correctly, or incorrectly. Uh, we couldn't share and talk about and develop things between us because she had no means of comparison. As time went by, I really did try to make an effort to make her take charge, to her take responsibility. And she has become more assertive in the last 3 to 4
weeks. You know, she has shown some leadership in terms of disciplining the students and filling out discipline referrals and so forth. But our main communication has been just sitting and talking.

(Interview #4)

Donna's frustration, then, was not just that she and Kelly were uncomfortable in their conferences, but that things weren't going very well in Kelly's classroom. She knew some things that Kelly needed to do, but felt that she wasn't supposed to be telling her directly because she thought that was not the way a Clinical Faculty member was expected to supervise student teachers. Because she had inferred that judgment is negative and to be avoided, she was being very careful not to judge Kelly or to tell her what to do to correct the situation. For someone who believes teachers should have good classroom discipline and that students should be expected to develop self-discipline, something, indeed, was very wrong with "this Clinical Faculty thing."

In the last half of student teaching, Kelly had become more assertive; thus, Donna's concerns about the classroom had probably decreased. Donna had heard an explanation of the intentions of the Project leaders and a clarification of the purposes of the "Thinking about Teaching" Task. Her colleagues in the Project had affirmed the value of direct feedback early in the student teaching experience and the
importance of moving the student teacher to thinking about her work.

In the final interview, then, Donna was able to relax more and think about how the experience had gone for her and for Kelly.

I have tried to get Kelly to talk about how she feels about her teaching. And I tend to think -- although I didn't take any notes with my other student teachers along these lines -- I was much more direct in telling them what to do, and when to do it, and how to make...when and how to make decisions. I have made a conscious effort to try to get Kelly to look at what she's doing and how effective she is, and to make her own judgments and to make decisions on her own as quickly as possible. She picked up on that and has gone with it. I probably wasn't as good a listener as I was with Kelly. I tended to do most of the talking, but I, I found myself.... I think this time a much better listener than I have ever been -- much more of a mentor. I am trying really hard to be a co-worker instead of a supervisor. Although I think you need to be somewhat of a supervisor because you are the one -- I was the one with the experience. (Interview #4)

By late March, Donna's misperception of the intended message of the "Thinking about Teaching" Task was clarified. By then, however, she had experienced a great deal of frustration in her work with her student teacher and had developed a negative tinge to her otherwise generally positive attitude toward the Project.
In May, although she had clearly been moved off center temporarily by the frustration and anxiety of her attempts to be very indirect early in Kelly's student teaching term, Donna remained generally positive in her sense of herself as a teacher educator.

Becoming a Teacher Educator

During the first year of the Project, Donna was aware of her role as a Clinical Faculty Project member. She also was increasingly aware of herself as a teacher educator.

The Role as Project Member

Throughout the Project year, in her talk with me, in her interactions with colleagues in the large and smaller group sessions of Phase II, and in the final session late in May, Donna made direct and indirect references to the Project suggesting her awareness of her role in it. She often said phrases such as "So here I am in a Clinical Faculty experience ...."; "And being in this Clinical Faculty thing ...."; "...my sense of the Clinical Faculty Project..." (Interview #2); and "My sense of being in this Project..." (Math Session 3/7).

Once when talking about how she was careful about letting her know where she would be in the text when it was
time for Kelly to take over her classes, she admitted, "I was a bit more conscientious about having been in the Project because I thought surely she would be evaluating me about this thing" (Interview #4).

Donna also recognized that others were aware she was in the Clinical Faculty Project. At one point she was concerned that her intentional, planned induction was making Kelly feel that she was less capable than another student teacher who was assigned to a non-Project cooperating teacher -- because Kelly was not starting to teach as soon as the other. From time to time she shared information with that colleague. "He was interested in what I was picking up from my Project meetings and how he could use this with his student teachers (Interview #4).

In the math small group meeting on February 8, Donna told her colleagues that her student teacher had said that she was glad she was with a Clinical Faculty member. (This was before Kelly reported to her university professor that the Project was a failure.) At the final session on May 24, Donna wrote that she was surprised that her student teacher was so interested in the Project.
Efficacy as a Teacher Educator

More important than her awareness of being in the Project, however, is the evidence that Donna came to think of herself more as a teacher educator than she had in the past. As noted above, in both the second and fourth interviews, Donna indicated that she spent much more time working with her student teacher this year than she did in the past. She said, "I think this time I'm a much better listener that I have ever been -- much more of a mentor" (Interview #4).

It is also a new experience for her to be recognized by a colleague as somewhat of an authority in working with student teachers. "I never felt like I was telling him what to do, and he was interested, he was interested in the subject of our meetings" (Interview #4).

That sense of authenticity in her role as a teacher educator developed in Donna as she moved through the spring semester in the Project. In the February 8 small group meeting, one of the math education specialists suggested that the Project members might want to look at "observation" as a topic in their discussions. Donna admitted, "I don't know what to tell them to watch for, so I just tell them to focus on subject matter." At that time, she seemed to have had an awareness of herself in the role of facilitator to
the beginner's development, but she was also aware that she lacked the skills she needed to be effective.

In order to desire to improve our effectiveness in any particular role, it is first necessary to perceive ourselves in that role. One indicator that Donna developed in her sense of herself as a teacher educator is that she planned to ask Kelly to help her define her role. "I want to -- to get Kelly to tell me what she expects of me" (Interview #2).

In contrast to the February 8 session when the Clinical Faculty members sat back and looked to the university faculty members to take the lead in setting topics for the discussion, on April 5 the math teachers were quick to share their perspectives on how the State student teaching and student aide programs could be improved. At one point, Donna shared her view that beginning teachers should have a mentor teacher to help them through that first year. That Donna was openly critical of the university programs with the math education specialist from the university is another indicator of her emerging sense of efficacy as a teacher educator.

Both in her implications of memories of her own student teaching and again at the final session, Donna indicated that "wants to work with student teachers" is a critical quality for the effective cooperating teacher. That she
herself does so enjoy working with beginners suggests that she sees herself clearly in that role.

It is not, however, a role that she has, as yet, clearly defined. In the final interview when I asked if she would be willing to listen to the tape of the talk with Kelly and write a response, she was quite positive about her willingness to contribute to our knowing more about preparing teachers. She went on to note her sense of unfinished business in the Project and in teacher education in general.

What it takes is mentoring, and some supervision. I think most teachers would like some guidelines as to when and how and what they should deal with in terms of working with the student teacher. At this point, it has been a very subjective kind of training period. I really think they would appreciate it. I think that this can be tied into the first year teaching program, because I see it as very much the same thing. If a certain person wins the next state election, we might be into merit pay and senior teachers and that kind of thing. I don't want to get into politics here, but I see a trend towards identifying certain teachers to work with student teachers. So there is going to have to be a plan of action for that. At the same time, I think we need it. It is a very ambiguous responsibility up to this point. I think it needs to be defined.

(Interview #4)

The tension between indirect and direct supervision still remained. Her need for specific guidelines as noted here and in her comments at the final session suggest again
her low tolerance for ambiguity. Donna wants to be told just where she stands by those whom she perceives to be her superordinates. She would, no doubt, have liked more direct input from Project leaders as to what she should do with her student teacher. Thus, the sense of incompleteness about both the first year of the Project and the definition of teacher education. What she did not realize, perhaps, is that she did exactly what the Project leaders were hoping she would do. She looked at a problem in teacher education, wrestled with it, looked at it again, came to some tentative conclusions, and shared her perceptions with her colleagues in the Project.

Conclusion

Donna Matthews is an energetic, experienced teacher who enjoys her job and her subject matter. She believes communication and classroom control are important in the teaching and learning process. She thinks that good teachers organize their work and plan their lessons effectively. For Donna, school is a hectic environment where her work is fragmented and she is frequently interrupted.

Overall, Donna Matthews' participation in the Clinical Faculty Project during the 1988-1989 school year appears to
have been more positive than negative. She experienced considerable frustration and anxiety as a result of her interpretation of the intentions of Project leaders with regard to one of the early Project tasks. From November to mid-March, that perception caused her to attempt indirect supervision strategies against her better judgment.

Once it became clear to her that others in the Project --both from higher education and from the public schools --believed that direct supervision was necessary at the beginning, her beliefs were validated, and her attitude toward the Project became more positive once again. Although she suffered some anxiety, she also experienced the growth that can come with looking at a problem and looking again.

The Case of Janet Harmon

Now in her thirty-second year of teaching, Janet Harmon teaches five classes of ninth grade Earth Science at Sparta High School.

Professional Biography of Janet Harmon

Janet Harmon might best be described as having spent her career as a utility teacher, going where she was needed by administrators who respected her capabilities. She has
taught, in her words, "every grade from first to tenth." She began teaching science right out of college at one of the city high schools where she taught for two years and then stopped. Three years later, due to a teacher shortage, she was recruited to teach elementary school which she did for three years. This is her seventeenth year at Sparta High School.

Janet has worked with about ten to twelve student teachers over the years. All but two of them were from Allegheny State University. She has worked with none from Highlands. Janet was surprised that she was invited to participate in the Clinical Faculty Project and is uncertain as to why she was selected. She thinks, however, that perhaps she was chosen because she is conscientious about her work and well organized.

**Janet Harmon on Teaching and Learning**

Janet Harmon is a teacher who thirsts for knowledge and wants her students to be aware of her interest in her subject matter. She is organized in her teaching and sees one of her roles as teacher as being the organizer of information and the explainer of procedures for her students. In her classroom, students conduct hands-on activities because Janet believes that people learn by
doing. She attempts to carry out that philosophy of learning with her student teacher.

A Thirst for Knowledge

Janet Harmon believes that one of her greatest strengths as a teacher is her own continuing interest in knowing more and more. The first time we talked, she told me,

I have been conscientious in preparation. I like to update my knowledge as far as news articles. I like to find new techniques, new laboratory facilities, anything I can facilitate to improve the students' understanding. I don't know, I always feel like I thirst for knowledge, and I like to impart that to the children. I like to let them think I'm interested because I am interested in earth science.

(Interview #1)

On another occasion, she made reference to having been to an energy conference last fall. In listing qualities she thought a good Clinical Faculty member should have at the final session, she noted "Be a Growing Educator (5/24). She was recently selected as one of 29 state participants in the American Astronomical Society's regional "Astronomer for a Day" program.
Organization and Planning

Another strength she identified was her organization. She said, "I am an organized person, and I think that is something that is important in teaching. Science is a laboratory subject, and the majority of the time is supposed to be [lab work]. So for this reason, we have a certain amount of structure" (Interview #1).

When she listened to a tape of one of her lessons, she became concerned that perhaps she was not as organized as she would like to be.

I was sorry I did not video tape. It bothered me when I listened to it because of the pauses in it. There was no connection between the times I was doing something with a student or showing something on the overhead, and it appeared disconnected. Perhaps it was disorganized, but it made me think about, am I doing these things? Am I really organized or not. (Interview #3)

Janet listed "Organization" as a main concern she thought a student teacher would have (2/28). When we talked about the importance of the student teacher's being prepared to teach, she relayed an anecdote from one of the student teachers.

I don't know whether it was mine or somebody else's who made the comment that one of the teachers said they didn't write any lesson plans, and all you have to do is go in there and teach, and so the student teacher thought it wasn't necessary. They fell out on their face, but the children nearly took them out. (Interview #1)
When I observed in Janet's classroom, I noted her organization and how she carefully explained procedures to her students. She told me how she plans her lessons so that the content is "in an organized fashion. It follows a sequence rather than we just go and talk about this today and tomorrow we will talk about something else." She talked about one of her lessons:

Today it would have been sugar cubes. I always put on the board what we are to do. And they knew which sheet to pick up. Within reason, they know exactly the things they are supposed to complete and what will be done to follow that up and that type of thing.  
(Interview #1)

She went on to say how she had attempted to clarify for her student teacher how she worked with the sequence in the classroom.

I said, "Sometimes you will notice I don't answer a child's question at that moment, And I will say, 'If you wait till we get to that..." simply because it will destroy the sequence that we have established and everybody is homed in on this sequence. If we throw in something, it will be confusing to the student. It is not that I won't answer the question...."  
(Interview #1)

Learning by Doing

Janet believes that student involvement in tasks is an important part of the teaching and learning process. When I
asked her how people learn, she replied,

I think they learn by doing. I suppose being in science, that is my philosophy that the more hands-on types of things they can do.... I also feel the more I can reinforce it in different ways.... I will use a puzzle or a review sheet, an exercise. The lab will be about the same topic in some way.

(Interview #1)

When I observed in her classroom, I saw a lesson that began with a discussion of the reasons we have different weather patterns in the temperate zones. Then Janet explained the procedures the class was to use each day during the next few weeks for gathering data about local weather conditions.

She told the class.

O.K. For directions.... We're going to fill in the table below for the period designated as two weeks. Second, we're going to make our observations at about the same time of day which will be at the beginning of this period. Number 3, any information which cannot be obtained by direct observation may be taken from newspapers or weather reports. So, when are we gonna have to do that? On weekends. Unfortunately, this weekend you will have three days -- Friday, Saturday, and Sunday -- that you may get this information, so check your newspaper. The data is there just inside the first page. Does everybody know where to look for it? O.K. Good. Take the weather forecast. That would be the forecast for today. The last bit of data we'll probably use -- you can get that from the radio, TV, or the newspaper. On the next day, place a check next to the forecast for correct or a cross if it's incorrect. On the last day, we'll make a forecast ourselves. Also, on the last day, we'll summarize it so we can see a pattern here. So you'll need to
keep this in your notebook.

(Observation 2/15)

One instrument the class was to use was the sling psychrometer. She explained how to obtain the relative humidity by using readings from that instrument.

When we come in, and we have our difference in temperature, we'll use a table to get our relative humidity. Across the horizontal is the difference in temperature, and this will be in degrees Celsius. You can see how....

Each of you will be working with this. When you bring back your data, I'll help you to read the Relative Humidity Table. This would be .5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, and so on. Then your dry bulb temperature, or your air temperature is on this vertical line. Where your temperature and the difference in temperature meet -- that coordinate -- is your relative humidity. So, you would have to have your difference and your temperature, where they meet, that coordinate to get your relative humidity.

(Observation 2/15)

Just as she believes that her students learn best when actually doing the task at hand, Janet believes a student teacher learns best by actually teaching. When I asked her how student teachers learn, she said,

By doing and observing, but most of them, I think, grow after they've started actually teaching. The first week or so, you hold your breath because you think, "Oh dear, what is going to happen next?" And then, it is, I think, refreshing to see as time continues, that they begin to pick up some of the things and to get the idea of what they are going to be doing. But again, just like science, I think it is hands on activity, and actually doing the job, and it will be different when they start teaching.
In the small group science meeting, when they discussed varying approaches to phased in the student teacher, Janet explained her rationale for having Greg start with three classes.

I feel that when they're teaching three classes -- in the first they make mistakes. Therefore, you can work with them. We're fortunate. We have lunch right after the first one so we can modify the problems in the first one to help go to the next one. If we see a problem there, then by the third one, we have worked out some of these things that either Greg or I see. (3/1)

Modeling Good Teaching

She is also aware of herself as a role model. Early in Greg's time with her, she took care to tell him reasons why she was doing what she did. "As I would circulate among the students, I would try to point out some things that he might observe that I was doing while I was teaching, or things that I asked to be done and the reasons that I did ask that to be done" (Interview #2). When asked if her student teachers adopted her teaching style, Janet replied,

Probably most of them. I encourage use of such things as transparencies, and all sorts of labs, videos -- different approaches to it. I guess the interesting thing would be to see what they do the following year when they are out there on their own. I am sure they mimic us a good bit. That is what worries me; that is what makes it awesome -- to think their lives, and ultimately the lives of so many that they will work with --
I'm the one. I mean, I am responsible for it, and we hope it is good. (Interview #1)

Janet believes that it is her responsibility to challenge her students to do their best, especially those who are going on to higher education. She talked with me about that sense of responsibility.

I feel that I am hard. Particularly these advanced [classes] don't like it that I don't ask them factual questions. They have to put some ideas together to get an answer. I feel that this is important, particularly in advanced classes. They are college bound. They are not going to college and have facts given them to regurgitate on an exam, or on any test. And I would do them an injustice if I didn't do some of this. And yet, if we can make it pleasant, and they enjoy finding out where they were wrong or I was wrong, and we can get some ideas, or at least make them start thinking. As I said, [make it] fun or interesting to them. (Interview #1)

She also indicated different ways that she attempts to create student interest with games such as "Energy Jeopardy" and "Energy Bingo" (Interview #3).

Although she believes she conducts her class for the benefit of her students, she sometimes wishes they responded more positively to her. She said,

They think I am ready to kill them, and I will do anything to kill them, but I won't. I have nothing but their interest.... And maybe they interpret that the wrong way sometimes. But I feel that I don't make them measure up, then they are never going to. I can't live with myself if I don't demand a certain amount of them. So, I have a designation of being a hard teacher. My husband says, "No, you are a challenging
teacher." I don't think I am all that hard. I like to think I do a good job, whatever way. I don't know how to put it.

(Interview #1)

She appeared to take satisfaction in telling me about one case where a student expressed appreciation to her for her being "hard."

I would like to think that I am hard in that I challenge...; I try to extract the best from them, rather than the fact that they feel that I am being just arbitrarily a mean, hateful soul. One of my students gave me a Christmas card that said -- this past Christmas -- "I didn't like you at first, but I like your being hard because I am learning something." And I thought... That did give me a little bit of hope, that this is one that recognizes the fact that my being hard is to extract the best from them, rather than to allow them to get by with things, and ultimately they'll get by with that much more and...that much less in the long run.

(Interview #1)

Although that student appears to value education, Janet is concerned that so many do not. In listing her concerns as an experienced teacher, she wrote, "Educational values of students" and "Acquaint parents with the students' 'world' (their problems at a given age) and convince parents of schools' importance (10/28). Janet shared with me her concern that today's children are very different from those of the past. She said,

I like children. I like working with them, even though there are times today that I have difficulty coping with some of their language and their attitudes. I think that gets me more than anything else, but I always
felt that if I'm fair with them, and I try to do for them, that they are always going to reciprocate, and they don't. Not any more. I think I have had to relax some of my structure because children today are not the same children. You used to be able to get them to sit down and behave. Now, I suppose they see these things on T.V. that are so cute to do to a teacher. You are constantly trying to think beyond them before they outwit you, and sometimes that gets tiresome. You feel like, it bothers me sometimes if I am not teaching as much as I like to teach, because I am so busy trying to keep ahead of what is happening, or what is going to come up next -- what could happen. And it makes your mind wander -- at least a old mind.

(Interview #1)

Janet Harmon believes that an individual's home background plays a very important role in his or her success in school and in life. She talked about her own upbringing and how she had developed her attitudes toward learning:

My background has been a family of education. Our lives have been focused on -- the most important thing is to have an education. My father always said if there is nothing else I can ever leave you.... I can't, I may not leave you money, but I can leave you an education. That is the best thing I can leave you. So, that always has been sorta my philosophy with myself as well as with my children.

(Interview #1)

She also linked her sense of changing times to her concern for the home environments of some of her students.

I have seen a lot of different students. I have seen a lot of different teaching attitudes -- from a private school to a public -- and of course, even private school has changed considerably. When I first went to North Crest, it was a very serious structured course. I think today about what
those kids did -- and parents backed you. I can't get them to do it today. This is probably a frustrating aspect of being so old. I feel that there is a possibility of teaching more than I am able right now because of studying and what comes to us. I'm trying to adjust to that, but I don't think younger teachers would see this like I would. I feel that we are going to have to come back to some of this when we hear of how low the United States is in math and science in particular. It is sad, but we can't get children to learn any more than they are willing to do, or their parents are willing for them to do. (Interview #1)

She cited lack of parental support in doing homework as one of the problems she faces.

Out of the 24 or 5, I might have 5 papers. They wouldn't finish their labs. Now I am beginning to get half of the papers, and I feel like it is a step in progress that they now want to get it in. They are now doing their labs, and they are turning them in, and they always do homework. But obviously they probably don't have a home life that fosters doing much at home, so I feel that we have accomplished something to get that much interest.

In contrast, students in her upper level classes completed their work more consistently, a factor she attributed to parental support. "They weren't as notedly bad as this class. At least they would turn in their homework, their parents were seeing that they had done something" (Interview #1).
Later, she reported her attempts to empathize with students with whom she had little in common and to help Greg understand the aversive behaviors of many of his students.

I guess I always looked at the fact that they didn't have homes like mine or they didn't have homes like somebody else I knew, which sometimes is a little difficult. I'm not familiar with living in a broken home, but I see that this is so commonplace in our students. Many of them live in a matriarchal home anyway. That has been something that I've spent a great deal of time helping him understand that no matter how long you teach you're not going to reach maybe ten percent of them each class period. Maybe you'll get another ten [percent] tomorrow, but that's sometimes fortunate, particularly when you're teaching in a situation where you have all walks of life -- students whose background is not conducive to learning. (Interview #3)

The day of the first interview, Janet had just come from a meeting with the principal and the mother of one of her students from that "walk of life." She was upset about the mother's having taken the side of her child against her in an issue of his not doing his school work.

Students in Janet Harmon's class are expected to use the class period to the maximum. She told me, "I am a firm believer in starting class and working completely through. I have every minute planned, and I try to have it so it is not going over or isn't going under." Another time she said, "I make every effort to use every minute." (Interview #1).
She also reported that she is careful to include only activities that foster learning. "I teach a filmstrip. I stop when there is something to discuss and make them take notes. To me, it is a learning thing or we don't have it. I don't like movies or things like that for the sake of a movie" (Interview #1). In her description of one of the written cases, she was critical of the teacher for showing a filmstrip as a treat (10/28).

Along with full use of academic learning time, Janet is concerned with classroom management. When asked to focus on some aspect of the first written case she had described, she chose "classroom management" as her focus (10/28).

Although Janet strives to make her classes interesting to her students, she believes that some of them have backgrounds that do not support success in school. Even so, Janet makes every effort to use class time well and to foster a good learning environment for her students, and she wishes more of them appreciated her efforts.

Janet Harmon and the Clinical Faculty Project

Janet Harmon made several connections between her participation in the Clinical Faculty Project and her work as a teacher and a teacher educator.
The Project Discussion Sessions

Some of the topics discussed during the second semester appear to be linked to changes in Janet's attitudes and behaviors this year. She referred to the "Remembering Student Teaching" task when she talked about her increased sensitivity to her students and to her student teacher. Although Greg had been with her in the fall as a student aide and needed very little orientation to Sparta High School, she planned for his induction into student teaching. She also indicated an awareness that, ideally, student teachers experience growth across time.

Sensitivity to Needs, Perspectives. In addition to her empathy for students who do not have a supportive family background and her desire to acquaint parents with their children's problems during their teenage years as noted above, Janet is sensitive to students in her classes in other ways. For example, she said that she works at tuning her voice so that it will be pleasant for them to hear (Interview #3).

Janet is also sensitive to her student teachers' needs and perspectives. She became increasingly so this year after participating in the "Remembering Student Teaching" task and as Greg continued to struggle in his teaching. She talked about her sense of what it must be like to begin
student teaching.

The awesomeness of all the things descends on you at one time, such as with new teachers. And I'm sure the student teachers feel the same way. The first day you get there, they hand you the handbook, the plan book, the grade book, and the stack of things. We have been in it a long time now and think "OK, I'll read that later." It is hard for them to realize all of the things that have to be thought about and categorized in your mind and on a piece of paper. And a lot of it has to be right in here. (Interview #1)

She also indicated her empathy for those student teachers who have to hold down jobs while student teaching. In the past, and with Greg, Janet has been concerned with the paperwork that is expected of the student teachers by the university, and she has tried not to add to that burden.

Once Greg started teaching, Janet felt that she needed to give him lots of positive reinforcement. She said, "He felt that he was not doing a good job, that his class was not under control. I spent a good deal of time reassuring him that he does have good control." She also indicated that her main task with Greg was, "combatting his being extremely discouraged with the whole thing" (Interview #3).

When all of the Project science teachers and their student teachers met together, one of the other student teachers said she had no problems and went on and on about how wonderfully everything was going for her (3/1). After that meeting, Janet had to pump Greg up again, "because he
just felt like there was something radically wrong with him or our students or whatever if that was such a wonderful situation" (Interview #3). Although Janet was very sensitive to Greg's perspectives, she found it difficult to communicate with him because he is such "a sensitive person" (Interview #4).

When I asked if she had ever given Greg non-verbal signals while he was teaching, she replied, "No, because he seems to be easily frustrated. I have done this before, but he was not the type that could handle it." Despite her increasing exasperation with his inflexibility, she remained sensitive to his perspective. In the last interview, she continued to be understanding, saying, "I know he couldn't help it" (5/1).

In late October, the qualities she listed as important for the cooperating teacher included: "Be flexible" and "Make, take the time to work with the student teacher." At the final session in May, her list included the same thing written several different ways. Her brainstormed list included:

(1) Compassionate

(2) Continued guidance
   a. Planning
   b. Coping with frustrations (guidance)
(3) Understanding of student teacher's fears

(4) Guiding with suggestions rather than definite plans

(5) Helping with the expressed fears of the student teacher -- guiding with ideas for surmounting them

(5/24)

It is as if she is trying to find a way adequately to express her thoughts about this recent experience with Greg. Janet had developed a sense that she should not give Greg too much information to process all at once because of the potential for overwhelming him. She told me,

I tried to give him only the things he would be most concerned with for several weeks, rather than many, many things that would perhaps overwhelmed anyone coming into a situation. So, these were things like grading, things that he would be most involved in at the immediate time he would start teaching. I have not addressed that [management] issue yet because I feel that if we get the teaching going, then all of this other will fall into place. (Interview #2)

She connected her concern to the "Remembering Student Teaching" task. She said,

Some of the meetings that we have looked at our own situation made me look at my student teaching -- I don't remember much about it -- and the days that I've started in a new situation. It is always overwhelming. You go into a, a new school system -- I didn't even change where I was working and I changed school systems from the County to Sparta City -- and it is somewhat overwhelming. And I
had been teaching for quite a while.

(Interview #2)

Late in the term, she came back to the topic of what it is like to begin, citing her own student teaching, but again drawing on her more recent beginnings of a new year.

Anybody's nervous when they start with a new group. I am every year when I start a class each year, because you don't know how they're going to react, at which moment you're going to have something that sort of blows up in your face or just to stay two or three steps ahead. These are some things I tried to prepare the student teacher for by looking at what comes up here in the class, and looking back at your own student teaching. Of course mine's so long ago, it wasn't any point in looking back there, because I couldn't remember.

(Interview #4)

Thinking about what it is like to approach anything new, also seems to have been related to Janet's becoming increasingly focused in her work with Greg this year.

Planned, Intentional Orientation. In the past, Janet usually had been informed that she was to have a student teacher, but had no contact with him or her before the beginning day of the student teaching term. Because Greg had been with her all fall as an instructional aide, they were already very well acquainted, and he had less need for the sort of planned orientation that most of the secondary Project members developed in the January sessions. She was, however, excited about those discussions, and looked forward to using such a strategy in the future. She said,
We have looked at other people's, what they expect of a student teacher, outlines they have devised -- giving them a schedule. I've not put that into writing this year, but I would like to -- for another time. I think it would be a good format for anyone to follow. (Interview #2)

When she talked of her approach to orientation in the past, she seemed to be embarrassed by the lack of planning. I asked her how she had inducted previous student teachers. She went on to talk about how Greg's planned induction was more intentional.

I suppose this sounds kind of ridiculous, but as much in a hurry and as quickly as we could try to get things together. I would usually have gotten maybe the textbooks together. But I never did make the preparation that we made well in advance here, nor did the student teacher request any prior information. They didn't come with already-prepared units and that type of thing. That was all done after they were here. I introduced them to the librarian. Some of them are here a month before we have a faculty meeting, but they were always introduced in a faculty meeting. But to find the time to go take them to the office, or to take them to repro-graphics.... Often I feel bad they have to defend for themselves, or get a student, if you have a reliable one to take them different places. As best as we could get the time, we would take them to a place or introduce them to somebody. [This year] the specifics would be the fact that I assembled handbooks -- the teacher's handbook, the student handbook -- well in advance because he came two weeks or so before, and I gave him a schedule. He was introduced to all of the science department, because we did have a change at the semester -- one teacher came back -- so he did get a chance to get to know everybody in there better. We got that type of thing organized
as well as, again, for him to do his unit work. He got materials well in advance and that I have never given a student teacher before. They may have gotten that together later, after they got here. He had my folders, my books, list of filmstrips, list of materials that we use. In general, he had everything to outline what he was going to do.

(Interview #2)

Even though Greg had been with her all fall, she collected materials for him much as the other Project members did for their new student teachers.

I had always gathered such things as a grade book, plan book, and maybe a student handbook. And the ideas evolved from our meetings to give them some other things. And it was a very pleasant result when he came that I had two red pencils, two pencils, and things of that nature all tucked in this little packet for him, and it just, it was almost like a present that I had put those little things that he hadn't expected to get.

(Interview #3)

Three different times during the small group science session to which the student teachers were invited, Greg made reference to that packet of materials that Janet had given him at the beginning. The first time, he listed the items and said how much he appreciated the gesture. The second time he brought it up, he told of how she had sorted out those policies he would need to know from the beginning. Later, when asked what she had done for him that they should be sure to do for other student teachers, he recommended both the packet and the sorting of important topics of
information (3/1).

Although Janet became increasingly sensitive to Greg's perspectives and was, perhaps, more intentional in her work with him than she had been with previous student teachers, she was to be disappointed in his development as a teacher during his term with her.

**Anticipating Growth Across Time.** From the beginning, it was obvious that Greg knew his subject matter. In various interviews during the spring semester, Janet said of him, "I feel that he is knowledgeable" (Interview #2); "He evidently has been a very good student, and that has been his life" (Interview #3); and "He was perfectly able to present the material, and he knew the material" (Interview #4).

She was also complimentary of his thoroughness in preparation. She noted that, "He already had the chapter that we were going to begin after he came, and he was prepared to go right into a chapter as soon as we finished ours. He had already done his unit." She went on to comment on how he always came with written questions for her each morning (Interview #2).

With his knowledge of science and his obvious willingness to devote time to preparation, Janet probably anticipated that Greg would grow as a teacher with time. In
the past she had looked at the student teacher's improvement when doing the final evaluation. The second time we talked, she voiced her sense of student teaching as a developmental process: "How did they improve? How did they change things that needed to be changed? And how did they cope with situations?" Later, she told me, "Any teacher improves with time (Interview #3). Despite the focus in the large group secondary Project sessions on attempts to identify developmental stages in student teaching, Janet said very little else about the concept of growth over time. Instead, she continually focused on Greg's need to be more flexible.

"Flexible, open to change" was a quality that Janet had identified as necessary to the effective cooperating teacher back in the fall. She had been also been struck by the agreement in the group that being "flexible, open, broad-minded, receptive" was important (10/28). It was, again, one of the characteristics of a good Clinical Faculty member that she listed at the final session (5/24).

When we talked in late February, Janet first indicated her frustration with Greg's lack of flexibility. She smiled and shook her head as she spoke,

Well, he is different from the ones that are younger. He is just very intense, but he is very organized. This may sound wrong: I am trying to disorganize him. I am trying to bring him down to relax with what he has to cope with. It going to be.... Certainly, it's not organized all of the time. In spite
of your organizational efforts -- they just don't always -- not when you are dealing with 20, 30 little minds that are going to rearrange it for you -- let alone the other rearranging of schedules and that type of thing.

As she continued, I began to realize that the problem was a serious one, and that this student teacher and she were struggling. It wasn't that he wasn't doing lots of things well. She noted his strengths as well as the qualities that were causing them both to be frustrated.

He has his life pretty well synchronized, planned. Everything fits in there. And this is not something you can do when you are teaching. You have to stop and be totally interrupted and wonder where you were when you go back. His comment to me was, "I don't see how you people do so many things at once and still get them all in the right track. I don't." But you have to. You have to learn to hand this one this sling psychrometer and this the one the barometer at the same time you are showing this one that this is the cloud chart. He is knowledgeable. They respond well to him. The students are all cooperating with him. And if they don't get precisely everything done during this class period, it is not going to be the end of the world. We will get it. But to him it is the end of the world. That is the way he is. He feels very devastated that he has not accomplished exactly what he is going to accomplish. But this is the way it is.

(Interview #2)

It is interesting to note that Greg's perception of himself in the classroom appeared to be quite different. Perhaps it was that Janet had encouraged him to alter his plans as needed so much that he truly believed he was doing
so, or that he wanted very much to believe that he was doing what she expected. Or, perhaps it is just that flexibility is, at best, relative. In any event, at the science small group session, Greg talked about how he changed. He said, "I end up changing and modifying my lesson plans each day, if not each class, when I find out something is not working" (3/1). At that session, she stuck up for him in front of the university supervisor who, in her judgment had nit-picked with Greg that day after observing his class. The university supervisor had made a comment about his having let a student go to the pencil sharpener during class. Janet felt that the supervisor did not have a good sense of priorities in her feedback to Greg. She expressed her concern that it was not appropriate to deal with trivial matters such as a student's going to the pencil sharpener. She said,

I have the feeling that Greg almost feels zapped sometimes.... Right now I'm more concerned with what Greg is doing with them as far as manipulating the classroom than whether a child went to the pencil sharpener. I'm trying to soft pedal what happened at the pencil sharpener and let's look at the thing that was really important and whether or not we had enough work or whether we included all students in our discussion. We'll get to the pencil sharpener. I'll worry about that maybe three weeks from now -- or we may never have to worry about it because it will fall into place once we get this thing together.

(Science Session 3/1)
At that session, Greg was still very positive toward Janet. When asked about being observed by both of them, he said very diplomatically, "I feel more comfortable with Mrs. Harmon because I've been working with her daily." He did, however, go on to articulate his feelings about what he also perceived to be trivial details in the supervisor's post-observation conference with him.

I've been involved in athletics. On the track team I used to throw things -- shot, javelin, hammer.... In learning a complicated event -- a complicated sequence of steps -- the thing you need at the beginning is not to be told every little thing you've done wrong. You need the Big Picture first. That's what I appreciate that Mrs. Harmon's been giving me. (3/1)

Despite his false or real confidence in early March, by early May, the situation had completely deteriorated for Janet. She was still laughing, but it was with a strained, anxious little laugh when she said,

I have said to him in various ways -- because I just don't think you can tell a person, a very sensitive person.... I don't think you can just say, "You just don't give a inch." I have tried various ways to point out ways in which he could have bent that rule. I have not had success with it. It is just a personality that I can't seem to be able to break. I don't mean to break it, but to change it. But I told my husband yesterday, he makes me feel like a friend that we had that never bent his shoes. You know, he never had any creases in his shoes because his feet.... I don't know how he walked without bending his shoes. I feel like that with my student teacher. I can't get him to
bend his body or his mind. It has got to go, whhiitt, one way. It has been frustrating. (Interview #4)

I went on to ask Janet what factors made the difference in whether their communication was strained or more relaxed. She didn't really answer the question, but rather went on with her description of her frustration, saying,

I would say the factors that made a difference would have been...our frame of mind at the time -- his and mine. Uh, he has been a sorta frustrating person to work with. I felt that when he started out older.... He wasn't 22, 23, and perhaps that has been a bad part. He is older and less adaptable to these things. I mean it's too late to adapt him. I guess, I don't know. But by the same token, I think he has that type of personality, and it's frustrating to me because maybe I have dropped to that level of uh, thinking or acting or whatever. But you have to, you have to relate to kids when you are in there. You cannot be somewhere up here, having a "lec-ture" and expect these kids to be there. I mean that is losing them right there. He was perfectly able to present the material, and he knew the material, but it was just the unbending mannerism. I could not.... I was having difficulty relating to him, and I think sometimes the kids were. And yet, sometimes they did seem to pay real close attention. It's indescribable. It has frustrated me, I guess. I have gotten to the point of...it's kind of worn me out to have student teacher this year. (Interview #4)

Despite her frustrations, however, she continued to say positive things about Greg -- and she continued to be increasingly open about his limitations.

As I said, he was good about relating and moving around in the classroom, and I mean
out from behind the desk during lab situations. But during discussions and that type of thing, he had difficulty. He gave the impression he was afraid to get out from behind the desk, that the students may eat him alive. And yet, I didn't perceive that with the students in attitude. So, I don't know what the problem actually is. I nearly cracked up. (Interview #4)

One of the factors involved in Greg's lack of development as a teacher may have been that very early in the term he made the decision not to seek a teaching job in public schools. He was ready to quit the program by February 22, but was talked into sticking it out so that he might complete the hours he needed for his masters degree. I happened to have an interview scheduled with Janet the day he announced to her that he had had it. She said,

Then his morning, 2nd period, he had questions after he had gone home and assimilated all of this. Uh, I suppose in his own mind -- he said he had talked with his wife, and she allayed some of his fears -- but he was ready to be through. That was the end of it. I tried to tell him that also this morning. But we got pumped back up to get this day going. (Interview #2)

Indeed, Janet's work with Greg appeared to involve pumping him back up repeatedly. Once he had quit in his own mind, he became a "lame duck" student teacher, one that Janet had to carry through to the end of the ten-week term.

When I probed to try to establish any sense of how she had approached their talk about his teaching, she was candid
about the difficult situation his lame duck status created for her. She told me,

I will be honest with you. He had said 2 weeks into his student teaching experience -- I thought he was going to quit. He said he wasn't going to do it anymore. Apparently he had discussed it at State, and they decided for him to go ahead and finish, but it was difficult for me, because I felt that I couldn't help him much because he was just finishing a course. The way I approached a lot of things were entirely different than if I had known that he was definitely pursuing teaching. I still try to do some of it, because even though he said.... Timewise, we had established a schedule that he would finish his teaching this past Friday. He announced to me a week ago or more that when he had his 120 hours, he just wasn't going to teach any more. I think he finally talked to [his university professor] and got the idea that it might be a good idea for him to go on and teach through Friday, at least 2 classes. But we never did insist on an all day situation or anything, because he just, as I said, he was meeting just the absolute requirements. So, I was in a bad position. I didn't know how far to push or not to push. (Interview #4)

Janet Harmon attended every session of the Project last year, including the secondary large group sessions devoted to talking about developmental stages of the student teaching experience. In her talk about her work with Greg, however, there is little attention given to the concept of growth over time.

One factor may be that the science education specialist from State did not direct the talk in the small group
sessions toward looking at what the student teacher should be able to do at different stages in the process. He also tended to do most of the talking in the science sessions, leaving less time for the Project teachers to bring up their own concerns (1/18; 3/1).

Another factor may be that once Greg had given up on himself as a teacher, he became a case of arrested development, giving Janet little to report to her colleagues or to her interviewer. In mid-February she told me,

He still tends to run to me, "Which should I do next?" which I think is natural, in a way, but I am trying to get him to.... This is one reason today I just moved right there in the door. I was trying to get him to go ahead and fend for himself a little bit, and see what was happening, rather than looking at me and saying what to do next, because he has it ready. He needs to learn. He's just been [teaching] less than a week, but he is trying to get it all done now.

(Interview #2)

By early May, there was a tinge of sarcasm in her voice as she explained that he never had been able to stop leaning on her. She was open about her weariness from carrying him when I asked her if they had continued to confer regularly about his teaching. She said,

Yes, I think we spent.... In fact, I led him through the first how many weeks until about the last week. And even now, last week, when he was supposedly by his little self, he couldn't make a decision. He was having difficulty in deciding what to do and when. I would get back in the prep room, and out of sight, and he would come back in there and
ask what should we do about this? And it wasn't just so much as for that, it was the fact that he, he didn't want it. He was just gonna do what he was gonna do to satisfy the course requirement. (Interview #4)

Although Janet Harmon has a sense of learning to teach as a growth process, this year her student teacher did not demonstrate much growth over time. Thus, she was unable to speak to this year's experiences when Project talk turned to developmental stages in student teaching.

The Thinking About Teaching Task

Janet Harmon became sensitized to differentiating between observations and judgments as a result of the "Thinking about Teaching" task last fall. She was able to make application to her interactions with her colleagues and with members of her family. She ran into difficulty, however, when she tried to incorporate her new awareness into her work as a cooperating teacher.

Differentiating Observations and Judgments. The work sheets Janet used for the "Thinking about Teaching" task suggest a struggle to understand a concept. They contain mark-outs and items placed in the 'wrong' category.

When I asked her to think about outcomes from that task, she described her sense of the importance of having thought about those distinctions. In March, she said,
I think probably the most important thing that was pointed out in those sessions and in doing those tasks was the fact that we are judgmental very often. Seeing chaos in our classroom -- that this is "bad," that this should not be. Whereas, sometimes the chaos is a very meaningful learning situation. And we need to observe it from that standpoint rather than the standpoint of what we think we see. Instead, assessing from the standpoint of what actually is happening there and the purpose of it in the first place.

(Interview #3)

Her application of her thoughts suggested that she had worked out meanings for each of the terms that were similar to the way they had been discussed in the Project. In that same interview, she talked about how her thinking toward some of her fellow teachers had changed. She shared a mixture of frustration that others may rush to judge her 'chaos' as non-productive and confession that she had thought that of other teachers' classrooms. She said,

I felt that it was most beneficial to me, not from the standpoint of student teacher/teacher relationships, but just in daily relationships with your peers, the teachers here. It's easier to walk down the hall and say -- with students all over the room -- there's just a fracas in there. There is no learning, no learning. Well, we're not sure what kind of learning. This has happened to me, to some of us in science. Science is a classroom that looks disoriented often because of do-what-you-may organization and everything else. The students appear to be disorganized, and some of them are. But they do have a specific task that they're to be conducting. So it's often a reaction of someone else to make a hasty judgement that that class is always in disorder. And that may or may not be true. But, it is
judgmental to assess someone else's actions in their classroom when you are not in the classroom. You really don't know what's taking place. So, it's made me think a little bit more of the comments that I've made offhand. It's not fair. (Interview #3)

She indicated that she had also found the task helpful in informing the way she interacted with members of her family and friends. She continued,

You can't help but think about it at home, too. If you're outside or with friends. Why did they do that? And some people are very critical of people saying things or doing things when, actually, they didn't have an ulterior motive at all. (Interview #3)

Perhaps the most important way that task informed her thinking was in her work with her students. She indicated a perception shift there as well.

How am I being judgmental with students. Am I sometimes quickly assessing something they're doing as being wrong, instead of trying to get there and question them and try to see what the real purpose was, what were they really doing instead of what I assumed or thought they were doing. (Interview #3)

She summed up her feelings about that task, saying,

It was a good lesson for me. I think it would be worthwhile for most everybody to sit through one of those. I told myself that I was fortunate that I had the opportunity to be made aware of it. In fact, the whole program has helped in a lot of ways. But, not only student teaching, but my teaching as well. (Interview #3)
When Janet attempted to apply her understanding of the importance of differentiating between observations and judgments with Greg, however, she ran into some difficulties.

Frustrated Attempts at Indirect Supervision. In her work with Greg, Janet made an effort to try to separate what she saw and heard from passing judgment on classroom events. When she talked about doing so in general terms, she said,

Well, in other words, to hear things in a different manner -- hear it from the standpoint of what exactly's happening in a situation rather than what I thought was happening -- what I thought I saw or what I thought I heard. Uh, I would just listen to it a little differently. (Interview #3)

Then I asked her to relate that to her work with her student teacher. She continued,

To try to, uh, with a student teacher to approach it from the standpoint of what value that type situation might have had rather than -- "That wasn't supposed to be." In other words, assess the value and the pluses, and the affirmatives of it, rather than whether or not it looked bad or wrong. (Interview #3)

In an attempt to get her to talk about how the task related to her work with Greg, I asked if the two terms observation and judgment ever came up in her talk with him.

It comes up, of course, with your thoughts because instead of being judgmental, I try to actually give it the observation that it should have -- observing this particular thing and this particular thing -- not
judging that this was right or wrong.  
(Interview #3)

I probed, asking her for an example.

Oh, well, probably an example would be his tendency to put questions before the class without addressing a particular student by name. This was something that was, perhaps, a direct observation rather than a judgment: the response that he was receiving while everybody was trying to answer. Sometimes a student teacher doesn't realize the chaos this creates for them. Whereas, just try to -- and it helps to learn names also -- try to select a name from a seating chart if you don't know who they are. Just try to observe a name quickly and then your question as it's coming -- which is difficult to tie in cause they're trying to keep their mind on what they're teaching and who they're teaching and their names. This was probably giving him the problem that was bothering him that there was not good feedback. Instead, it was chaotic in their answering him.  
(Interview #3)

Then I asked if Greg's behavior had changed after she had made that observation for him. She responded, "I've noticed it changing. He's more inclined to call on students. It's still a situation that needs work, but..." (Interview #3).

When I asked for another example of an observation she might have given him, she realized in the midst of giving the example that she had made a judgment. She said,

Observations being such as, uh, moving around among the students. Moving out into the classroom rather than being directly attached behind the desk. Um, maybe there's a fine line. That's judgmental there. It's judgmental that I think teachers should circulate.  
(Interview #3)
Then, after pausing to think for about 12 seconds, she offered an example of another time when she had judged a decision of Greg's:

I suppose I've been so aware of judgmental observations that I just try to avoid -- and probably I do, that I'm aware that I'm being judgmental. Some things.... I know one. He'd moved a seat, maybe that was it. And I was, I questioned it because I knew the young lady was a good friend of the one that she had been moved close on hand, and they would talk. Well, he had made a deal. She could stay there as long as she didn't talk. And it worked out. And, perhaps, that was judgmental on my part to question his moving her. (Interview #)

Later in that same interview I asked her to describe how she had gone about the task of taping samples of her talk with Greg. Instead, she talked again about the issue of calling names.

I've been, well, I would write specific things that -- exactly what I have observed -- such as, "When you asked a certain question, you didn't refer to a certain student." Uh, using names has been one of the things that I've had to get him to focus on. That one avenue. I said, "Don't worry about what you're teaching. You know your material, so focus on your interrelationship with the students." (Interview #3)

It was as if she knew the difference between giving observations and judgments, but that Greg required so much direct input from her that she very seldom could be indirect. Also, he was very unsure of himself and was,
perhaps, incapable of thinking about and modifying his performance.

Several times in our conversations, when she was telling of how she had tried to get Greg to do something differently, she slipped into relating the words she had used with him. Once she said,

And I said, "Well, you may think I'm hard-hearted, but I am standing here very positively and say, 'You have 15 minutes, and I mean it. Get your work done. That doesn't mean play.' And sometimes I may start to help this [one] over here, but this [one] is out of pocket on the other side, I have to go quiet that one first. And this one, I am sorry, will have to wait a minute, because this one's going to disrupt the whole class." I say, "You have just got to develop eyes in the back of your head, because they are all around you." And I have tired to say that to him. "It doesn't have to be in your journal! I mean, you have a journal. It has all of the materials in it you have actually been doing, but so what if you give them a extra thing, or so what if you changed the filmstrip, and it didn't' seem to go, and you have a video instead, and you listed it in there as a filmstrip? It still is doing the same job. Don't worry about it!" I don't know if you are familiar with the journal entries. But it had to be verbatim -- the way he was going to do it in the journal. (Interview #4)

Greg had been required by his university professor to write pre-teaching journal entries in which he was not only to think in writing about the upcoming lesson, but also to plan for contingencies, speculate, and anticipate problems. His interpretation, however, was that he was to do nothing that
he had not previously written in the journal. Her
frustration with the "carved in stone" journal did not come
out with me until the last interview, but it was, perhaps,
the aspect of Greg's approach to classroom activities that
frustrated her the most.

She went on to tell of a time when she could stand his
lack of appropriate action no longer and took over the
class.

I got up and gave out some sheets to some
kids that had finished work 20 minutes before
class time, and they were disrupting the
whole class. These are some things that I
have tried to point out, and I just could not
get him to do them. So I did it to show him
that it needed to be done. And that was bad,
I know. But again, I had reached my
frustration point. (Interview #4)

I asked her why she had said that what she did was "bad," in
whose eyes was it bad? She replied,

Well, I was trying not to usurp his authority
at that time. He was, I was trying to let
him.... Well, perhaps I was saving him as
well as the class, because I have to take
them over now again. And I also was trying
to point out to him what needed to have been
done, and I had been trying to tell him. It
didn't go through as far as suggestions or
guidelines. (Interview #4)

At the science small group session, she and Greg had joked
with the others about the times when he had needed bailing
out and she had to "put something in his hands." There were
jokes about a hook coming from the wings to pull him off
stage. In early May, she was no longer laughing.

Although, Janet became very frustrated in her work with Greg, in retrospect, she was able to recognize that the problems he had in teaching were more functions of his personality than of her abilities to perform her duties as his cooperating teacher. In our last interview, I asked if she had anything more she wanted to say about communicating judgments to this student teacher. She said,

Perhaps I have been more judgmental because it has been a situation I couldn't seem to control. I'd think I had. I mean we would sit down and go over these things. I would make suggestions, and I would offer some suggestions as to things that I had observed, and judgments I had made. And we were supposedly on target, and I would observe again, and there was no change.

(Interview #4)

Her list of qualities important to an effective Clinical Faculty member included, "Guiding with questions rather than definite plans" (5/24). She apparently understood how to approach supervision using indirect strategies. She did not, however, have a situation this year that allowed her to do so.

Becoming a Teacher Educator

Janet Harmon found her participation in the Clinical Faculty Project to be stimulating to her this year and a help in her work as a teacher. When asked in early November
if she had thoughts about her involvement in the Project at that time, she wrote, "Mind moving and thinking."

Ways the Project Was Helpful

There is evidence that she came to new perspectives about her interaction with students. After doing very brief case studies of two of her students, she noted that she had been "more 'picky' with the student you didn't like." When she listened to the tape of one of her own classes, she did not really focus on a teaching problem, but instead listened for tone and variety in her voice quality. Though she side-stepped the task of critiquing her teaching, perhaps the listening was a point of departure for thoughts about her teaching that she chose not to share.

In our last interview, she talked about how she had done some reflection on her own teaching this year. She said,

I sat down and worked out a different type of program that maybe the students would do on their own, keeping their grades on a sheet so they could see what they had done and not done. Some reacted negatively, but most of them reacted positively because it was a way for them to be aware of what they were doing or not doing. There is one thing about sitting and listening to a student teacher teach three periods, the same thing, you listen to a lot of things. You are also able to do some thinking of your own. You can jot down some notes and expand on it later. I can think more clearly in the classroom, hear what needs to be heard, but by the same
token, have a few moments to find something else. (Interview #4)

Greg was teaching three of her classes, and she could not leave the room. Thus, she had semi-released time in the classroom environment. In observing a student teacher who was struggling, she was confronted daily with problems in teaching.

Having been identified as someone worthy of selection for the Project may also have been a factor in her increased interest in thinking about classroom interaction. She noted,

I think you couldn't help but have some changes after you have spent the time that we have, delving into our souls. But I think it has made a difference. I have spent more time looking at other avenues of approaching the students -- maybe some of them good, maybe some of them bad -- but it's given me time, given me a thought to do some work, innovative things, perhaps I would not have done if I had not been working in this program. (Interview #4)

In one of our conversations, she attempted to articulate her sense of the professional stimulation offered by the Project sessions. She said,

I'd like to say that I enjoy these Clinical Faculty meetings. It's long and tedious, and sometimes I think, "Today's until six o'clock." But, somehow it goes by rather rapidly. I think we must have a group that works together in such a was that it isn't a task, but something.... It's a learning experience, and it's making us think differently. Making us think -- perhaps that's the whole thing. (Interview #2)
Later, she expressed again her sense of having taken energy away from the Project sessions.

I have thought sometimes I was so tired that I couldn't go do it, but after I went, I thoroughly enjoyed it. In spite of the fact that it has been work, I think it has also left all of us with a feeling of enjoyment, too. (Interview #4)

Asked to indicate what she had found most interesting and/or surprising about the Project this year, she wrote, "Informative meetings" (5/24).

The Role as Project Member

At the beginning, Janet Harmon lacked confidence that she belonged in the Clinical Faculty Project. When asked if she had any questions of comments about the Project, in November, she wrote, "How were we chosen?" In our first interview she said, "Last week my feeling was I needed help, and perhaps everybody realized this and I didn't." Later, that day, she told me, "I feel flattered, honored." Her written comment after discussing Analysis Task 2 with her colleagues was, "Felt I did not do the best work. I should not be paid for this" (12/7).

Although Janet began with questions about her selection to the Project, she came to see herself as a full-fledged Project participant. In the above examples of ways Janet
saw the Project as helpful to her, there are many indications of her awareness of her role in the Project. During the Project year, she continued to have positive experiences that caused her to be aware of herself as a Clinical Faculty member. Her colleagues at Sparta knew she had been selected. She told me,

Different ones have said, "Yeah, let's sit down some time at our department meeting and discuss some of those things. You could help us see what you have been doing, and bring them back for us." And so they have been interested in some of these avenues of what they can do that would benefit their teaching from what we have gotten -- which is supposed to be for student teachers, but it benefits us too. (Interview #4)

At the small group science meeting, Greg told the others that a fellow student teacher had commented to him about Janet's being in the Project. He said,

I know a student teacher who is not in this program. She mentioned how nice it was that I had a teacher involved in the program because I seemed to be a lot more prepared when I started than she had been prepared. (3/1)

Throughout the Project year, Janet carried a tension as to whether or not she was good at working with student teachers. She had been selected into the Project, and others saw her as effective. In light of the problems she was having in her work with Greg, however, she continued to lack confidence in her efficacy as a teacher educator.
Gaining Confidence as a Teacher Educator

Janet believes that she has expertise that would benefit someone learning to teach. She told me,

You have got to listen to somebody else. This is one thing I always tell student teachers, "When you go into a school, anywhere, ask the older ones to help you. They are delighted, and there is no better place to get help. Don't try to go it alone." Some of them come with the attitude, "Well, I already know how to do all of these things." And they don't seem to be receptive to the fact that they need to see what the rest of us can help them with.

(Interview #1)

She had had positive experiences with previous student teachers. In noting that communicating with Greg had been very different from the ways she had communicated with others, she said, "Other student teachers I have had have been more like sponges. They seemed to be here because they felt like I knew more than they did (Interview #4).

Despite her struggles with Greg, there were indicators that she came to see herself as a teacher educator. She told me that she believed that student teachers should not be enrolled in on-campus courses and that all cooperating teachers needed written guidelines for orientation of the student teacher and for phasing him or her into teaching (Interview #1). She also talked of her work with student teachers as part of her legacy to pass on to future generations.
I'm doing it for myself and for Greg and for whomever else follows me as a teacher. Because someone is going to come along and take my place, and I've been concerned about how this was going to happen and what types of teachers we were going to get. I'm much more encouraged about this.

(Interview #2)

Janet has also felt that she has been of assistance with other student teachers in her building. She told me,

This young lady was having difficulty with discipline. Sally is a student teacher in chemistry. The chemistry teacher ran into me and said, "You're working in this group. What suggestion can you have for how I can help her with her problem?" I made the suggestion that she focus on working with the students whether they're really learning any chemistry or not. It has been a help for me to have some suggestions for other teachers who have student teachers in my department.

(Interview #3)

She also sought information about a direct teaching model with which she was unfamiliar so that she would be able to acquaint student teachers with a model they might need to know to teach in the area (Interview #4).

In working with Greg, perhaps the most important function of a teacher educator that Janet experienced was that of the role of gatekeeper to the profession. She shared her feelings about his decision not to enter teaching, confiding, "Fortunately, he says he will never teach. And I don't think he is teacher material. I think this is the time to find it" (Interview #4).
When asked how the Project could extend its impact beyond the two funded years, Janet wrote, "Take information home to faculty"; "Clinical Faculty members have certification endorsement"; and "Continue meeting beyond the funded period" (5/24).

Janet Harmon had a tough time with this student teacher. She would have had a very difficult experience with Greg whether or not she had been involved in the Project at the time she worked with him. Because she was in the Project, she did not have to go it alone. She had opportunities to talk about her frustrations. Though she was not in their small group, she was aware that at least two other Project members were struggling with their student teachers (Interview #4). In retrospect, she seemed able to put the experience into perspective. She told me,

After this, I almost feel like.... Well, do I? Can I do this? Was there something wrong that I did, that after two weeks he absolutely announces, "This is it." -- that he couldn't manage. You can't help but feel, "What did I do to turn him off to all of this?" But I don't feel that I did. I feel it is his personality, his nature.

(Interview #4)

Thus, she was able to express her sense that Greg's failure was not hers to own.
Conclusion

Janet Harmon sees herself as a teacher who continuously strives to know more and who can organize and shape that knowledge so that it is accessible to others, both her students and her student teachers. She believes that people learn best when they are interested in their learning.

Although she became frustrated with her student teacher this year when he lost interest in teaching and when he was unable to be flexible in the classroom, she continued to be sensitive to his perspectives and feelings.

She understood the value of being aware of separating what actually is observed from making judgments about it. With a student teacher who lacked confidence and the ability to shift his plans in response to her input, she became frustrated in her attempts at indirect supervision.

At first uncertain that she belonged in the Project, she came to enjoy participating and developed a sense of efficacy in her work as a teacher educator.

The Case of Joan Brinkley

Joan Brinkley teaches Honors English 10, Special Materials English 9, and Humanities at Sparta High School, where she also serves as the Director of the Writing Center.
Professional Biography of Joan Brinkley

Joan Brinkley had an eleventh grade English teacher who served as a very positive role model for her. Joan knew before she went to college that she wanted to be a teacher. Although her mother was an elementary school teacher for over 30 years, Joan has always known that she wanted to teach teenagers. This is her sixth year at Sparta, and her twenty-first year of teaching.

Joan Brinkley has worked with approximately 15 student teachers from several area colleges over the years. Her first from State was two years ago. Another from State is presently assigned to her.

She believes she was chosen for the Clinical Faculty Project because she has had previous professional contact with Project leaders from both State and Highlands, including having taught a humanities course at State one summer with one of the State English education specialists. She also believes her good organization and knowledge of current pedagogy were factors in her selection.

Joan Brinkley on Teaching and Learning

Joan Brinkley is confident that she is a very good English teacher. Among the attributes that she considers to
be her strengths as a teacher, she includes her skills in locating and retrieving information and her ability to organize and plan for instruction. She also cites her patience and her ability to counsel with students.

Functioning as a "Stoplight"

One of Joan's greatest joys in teaching is to have former students return to share expertise they have developed as a result of something that began in her classroom. In our first interview, she told me about a martial arts demonstration her humanities class had enjoyed recently. She said, "They had developed an interest in something they were very good at now because of what they had learned in my classroom. And that is what teaching is all about."

When she talked about her ability to locate and retrieve information, she used the metaphor of a stoplight.

I like to think of myself as a stoplight sometimes. I know where to get information; I am good at that. I am very good at information retrieval, and I use a lot of things that I know are much better in my classroom as learning materials, and sometimes things that I can do. I know where to find them, and I bring lots of things into the classroom. I know where to guide the students to find information, and that is what I do a lot. There is no reason for them to always learn from me. They need to be independent and learn on their own. I like to think that I teach students not what to learn, but how to learn it, and where to find
information, and so we spend a lot of time in all of my classes in the library with what I call information retrieval. I think that is a strength I have. (Interview #1)

Whether Joan is in the classroom or the Writing Center next door, there is a steady flow of student traffic around her. Each one comes up, waits until she's available, pauses briefly with her, and moves on -- like vehicles at a stoplight.

She also wants her student teachers to develop their abilities to retrieve information.

I think that my greatest strength is finding materials and pulling together different resources, and sometimes they are so frightened of doing anything that is outside of the textbook. That is what I would like for student teachers -- to be very confident in finding and using material that is appropriate. (Interview #1)

The Importance of Organization and Planning

Joan believes organization and good planning are keys to successful teaching. When she described what she saw in one of the written cases, she wrote, "Lack of organization, management; what SOL (Standard of Learning)?" (10/28). She said of her own planning, "I am very organized in my approach...to the way that I teach my classes, and the way I prepare my materials" (Interview #1). At the final session,
her list of characteristics of a good Clinical Faculty member included "Organized" (5/24).

She also wants her student teachers to be able to organize and shape information into effective plans for classroom instruction. Her previous student teacher from State was very good at both finding resources and planning for teaching. Joan bragged on her.

She was very resourceful. We did, she did a unit on American Folklore and Appalachian Culture, and with the books that I had pulled from our library shelf she added on double that amount from State. And so we had about 250 books the kids were using as textual materials for their projects. She was very good designing projects; she was exceptionally good with the experience of teaching without a basal text, and finding materials herself and putting together things. That showed to me that no matter where she was, no matter what situation she was in in her teaching experience she could do it. And she did not rely on the textbook. We didn't have one. She was very organized, and she was meticulous at lesson plans and lesson design and she carried through all parts of the lessons, starting with her introductory remarks, her objectives and she always had closure to her lessons, and the students always knew what was expected in her classroom. (Interview #1)

Early in the student teaching term, Joan was working closely with her current student teacher to help her in planning. She told me, "I'm doing it one class at a time so that she can get used to making detailed lesson plans and unit plans" (Interview #2).
Later, in mid-March, she was apparently still involved in Betty's planning process as she mentioned having stayed at school until 4:30 one evening to help her with her unit plan (Interview #3). She believes that long term planning is especially important in her subject area. At the end of the term, she praised Betty's planning ability, saying, "In English you have to stress long-term plans" (Interview #4).

In addition to being good at finding resources and planning for teaching, Joan believes she is patient and good at counseling students (Interview #1). In her classroom, I observed her patience when a student asked a question about something she had just described in detail. Rather than scolding him for not listening or deriding him for asking the obvious, she rephrased what she had said, repeating the essence, and then when on. At the end of that class, Joan talked with a student about whether her case worker from the home where she lived was coming to talk with her on the upcoming Parent-Teacher Conference Day (Observation 2/16). She also noted "Patient" and "Counseling" as characteristics of good Clinical Faculty members (5/24).

Close Relationships with Students

Joan wants a close relationship with her students, and she keeps in contact with many whom she has taught. She
told me, "My students have become my best friends over the years, and I have contacts with them in almost every city I go to in this country, and even overseas. I keep up with a lot of them, and that is a great pleasure to me" (Interview #1).

She enjoys the successes of her former students, especially when they keep in contact and acknowledge the role her course played in stimulating their interest. In addition to the anecdote about the students who demonstrated their skills in the martial arts, she told of a young man whose interest had become the Appalachian culture.

I did a similar thing with another student. We were studying Appalachian Culture and I had no idea that he was that interested in what we were doing, and he read -- not one Foxfire book he was assigned to read -- but he read 8 of them, and then, I didn't know what he had done, but he wrote Elliott Wiggenton who was, of course, the starter of the Foxfire Books. Elliott sent him two free books, and he discussed with Elliott that because of my humanities class he had decided he wanted to live and to teach in Appalachia, and he would like to work with Elliott in the summertime. He is now at East Tennessee State and is doing exactly that. He comes back and lectures to my class about Appalachian culture and what it is like to live there. This particular student makes Appalachian crafts, and he made me a wonderful clock for my kitchen, and when I cleared out my parents' home for a sale last year, I found up in the attic an old, old quilt box, that I didn't even know it was there, and I gave it to him -- because I know he is interested in collecting antiques like that. And so there is an interchange that I really enjoy -- of sharing information. That
is my greatest joy I believe in teaching, is to see it come back to me, and seeing the kids get a lot further with the subject matter than I give them information.

(Interview #1)

Joan is frustrated, however, in teaching the ninth grade class this year, where she feels the kind of atmosphere she would like is not possible.

The 9th grade class is a very different story. I have not taught this age group in a long time. I have never had a group of students that had such a problem concentrating on anything. Uh, and I have never had a group of students who were so unwilling to be a part of a learning process as these are. They are tracked together all day long. It is my opinion, after researching their scores, some of them are there because of discipline problems and not because they fall in the range of Special Materials students. They feed off of each other's inattention, and they do this all day long. I have [had] conferences with 3 other teachers who had had the same problem that I have had with them yesterday, and it had happened all day long in similar instances in almost every classroom they're in. And it is almost a game to them. I have to treat them, as you would assume you might treat very young students who don't know the difference between standing up, walking around, talking whenever they wanted to, sitting still. I would like to have a very close atmosphere in that class, but I found out that you really can't. Uh, a one-on-one situation would be better with the student teacher. At least we can take half of the class and put them in small groups and work with them that way. I have to keep them far enough apart so that they can't touch each other or have eye contact with each other, and that really is an unpleasant situation for me, because it is not my style of teaching. And, the first day of class this fall when I came in, I thought
"Oh, I have got such a small class, and we can all sit together and get real close, and this will be just a real close nice situation where we can get a lot of learning done."
Wrong. That lasted about 10 minutes, and I realized what this group of students was like.

(Interview #1)

In contrast, she expects and gets a great deal of positive response from her upper ability level students. She said of them,

My work with honors students is very similar to my work with student teachers because I treat them as adults, although they are 15, 16 years old. My rapport with them is very much like the rapport with the student teacher. My other classes who are either general classes or slow classes, there is a great deal of difference. I mean they are students, and I don't give the latitude or the freedom to do a lot of investigative learning that my honors classes would normally do.

(Interview #1)

Joan did not hesitate to admit that her close relationship with students fulfills her personal need to nurture. She told me that she plans to retire early -- within the next few years -- and that she has misgivings about how she will respond.

I am not the kind of person who can stay at home and do a lot of community things, I need involvement with students. I have always needed that, and I don't have a family, these students are my family. I needed to be back. I don't know what I will do when I retire.

(Interview #1)
It is a valid concern. She currently exists in a lively environment with heavy student traffic constantly surrounding her, and where she is called upon to make several decisions per minute. For someone like Joan, who defines so much of herself in terms of professional role, retirement could be a shock to her sense of efficacy and to her self-esteem.

**Having a "Position" in the School**

Joan Brinkley presents herself as very confident in her teaching and in her role at Sparta. She is proud of her role as Director of the Writing Center, a position she created by securing funds for computers and word processing software and then convincing the administration to support the Center with space, supplies, and staff scheduling. When she told me of her interest in teaching writing with computers, she said, "I am Director of the Writing Center, and I have been working with students using computers for word processing now for about five years" (Interview #2). Her most recent initiative is to attempt to persuade the administration to support the purchase of a classroom set of laptop computers for use in teaching writing (Interview #1).

Other phrases that suggest self-awareness of role appear in her speech from time to time. She indicated that
Betty, her student teacher, had spent much of the first day, "...following me around, getting to know my position in the school." She told me, "There's so many things that go on in my life as a teacher here" and "She's learning things that I model and things that I do in both of my jobs here" (Interview #2). In describing her classes, she noted, "I teach humanities classes at this school" (Interview #1) and "It's not like walking into a regular English classroom. These are exceptional classes we are dealing with" (English-Social Studies Session 3/7). In that same session, she pointed out to her colleagues that her Honors English 10 students were each required to turn in 36 pieces of writing that grading period.

Having taught only upper ability level students for the past several years, Joan is teaching a "Special Materials" section of English 9 this year. The addition is reflected in another statement about her "position" at Sparta. She told me, "When you are a public educator, you are committed to educating the entire public, not just the part of the public that suits you best or has the best rapport with you, and I have certainly taught the gamut of the public in the last 20 years (Interview #1).
Learning by Modeling

When I asked Joan how people learn, she was quick to respond, "They learn by my modeling. I know that." She went on to give an example.

I just do a variety of things with them. Like in creative writing, I am right there with them. I do as much writing as they do. I feel that they need to see my writing if I see their writing, and so I am part of the class at this point. I am not always that way, but I think that is one way that students can learn by doing and they learn by watching me do something I asked them to do. (Interview #1)

Once, Joan tried to tape one of her demonstration lessons with one class to be used as a model for students who came into the Writing Center needing similar assistance. She discovered that, in that case, the use of modeling was inappropriate because "it had to be a one-on-one thing. What I said to the students at that session would not apply to other students who came in there without me" (Interview #3).

Joan has found modeling a professional attitude toward her student teacher in front of the class to be successful. She told me, "I keep a very professional attitude toward my student teachers, especially in front of my students because I want them to do the same thing with her. There should not be any problem of disrespect or trying to challenge her" (Interview #1).
In addition to modeling with her student teachers for the class, Joan recognizes that they model their teaching behaviors after hers during the first part of the term. She said,

I think that early on in their student teaching experience, they try to imitate what I do, maybe for the first three or four weeks, but when I do leave the classroom scene, in that we are not working together with students, or that I have nothing to do with the lesson, I see them being more independent of me. I would sort of like for them to take on some things that I do -- the way that I teach. The way that I keep attendance, and the procedures that I do are very efficient, and I hope that some of that they will duplicate. But I don't insist they duplicate my style because they don't have the same experiences that I do, and they certainly don't have the knowledge that I do, in that I have taken twenty-four hours on past my master's. So, I would not expect them to be an expert on things that perhaps I have more knowledge than they do.

(Interview #1)

And, indeed, both in the fall (10/26) and again at the final session (5/24), Joan listed being a "Good role model" as an important trait for someone working with a beginner.

**Awareness of Current Pedagogy**

An integral factor in her sense of herself as a good teacher is that Joan believes she utilizes current pedagogy in teaching both writing and literature. Joan loves to teach writing, and frequently talked about it in our
interviews. She said that she uses many of the techniques associated with process-based writing, the currently preferred approach. As noted above, she writes with her students. She also has students do pre-writing activities such as brainstorming. She described one such assignment that her Special Materials English 9 students had enjoyed.

It was a little experiment that I call a fingerprint description. I had an ink pad, and they put their fingerprints on a piece of paper and then they draw critters or people or whatever around this fingerprint, and I use it as a basis of a writing assignment. After they draw a critter, then I have them think of ten adjectives including a name to describe this critter, and then, we work from that kind of brainstorming activity to the topic sentence to a story. (Interview #1)

As noted above, she has been very active in bringing the use of computers to the teaching of writing in her own and other English classes at Sparta.

Joan has also used writing folders and a portfolio approach to collecting and evaluating student writing. In doing so, she has involved students in some self-assessment of their work. She explained,

I have given students more of an opportunity this year for input on their own progress. For example, when I ultimately graded 6 weeks of creative writing, the student had to organize his folder, bring it to me, discuss his work, discuss his progress and then evaluate what kind of letter grade that we would assign to this work. We all agreed that I could not put a 87.23 on a piece of creative writing. I think that most of them were very, very realistic about what they
thought they deserved. Some students' folders have as many as fifty pieces of writing in six weeks. Thirty-six were required. And, you multiple that times forty-two students. Fortunately, though, about that time my student teacher was well into all of that. She started teaching my honors, one of my honors class, my big one in the middle of creative writing unit and -- she is so good at that -- and it was a real good experience for her to be able to jump into something that she liked to do. And so, I did not grade all of those thousands of pieces of work. She helped.

(Interview #4)

With regard to the teaching of literature, she appears to know and to value the currently accepted "response" approach. In describing one of the teachers in the written cases last fall, she wrote, "Teacher-centered. 'I/me' syndrome. Judgmental. Stifling. Had the right idea -- philosophy of literature -- blew it." About the other one, she wrote, "Used small groups. Let groups prepare with guided instructions and present to class -- to generate discussion, teacher as a participant. How to appreciate literature -- not narrow approach of what to point out as important" (10/28).

The day I observed her class much of the interpretation of the play "The Taming of the Shrew" came from the teacher. The students had read the play in preparation of seeing it performed at an area theater. That day they were going over study questions they had done on their reading. Most of
Joan's talk was punctuated by questions to and responses from students. During the period, she called the names of at least sixteen different students, nearly everyone in the class. At one point she discussed the play at length, only occasionally interrupted by student questions about plot details.

JB: When the 3 couples all get there, all of their identities are unrevealed in the plot. OK. Now, we're gonna do #8. Let's talk a little bit more about the attitudes toward courtship and marriage. There were three different attitudes toward marriage in the play. One of them we've just discussed. It's about marriage as a financial arrangement. The second one shows up in the subplot, and it's marriage based on love. How does Lucentio woo Bianca? ...? When he is teaching her about literature, about the ancient writers of Greece and Rome, he's very careful to her, and he tries to be very tender to her -- just exactly the opposite of the relationship between Kate and Petruchio when he tries to woo her. And, Bianca does fall very much in love with Lucentio, and he with her. So, the second attitude toward marriage would be one that would be very desirable by young people -- they weren't allowed to do this very much -- and that's marry who they wanted to. Now, how did Bianca end up marrying who she wanted to? ...She thought she was in love with a man named Cambio. ...

S: She just ran away.

J: and he was really Lucentio. And her father promised her to the real Lucentio, but she had defied him. She takes on a lot of Kate's personality and she ran away and eloped and got married -- for love. Yes, Tim?
T: Cambio's the real Lucentio? And you said the father wants her to marry the real Lucentio?

J: Well, you're right -- to what he thought was the real Lucentio who was actually Trenio. And so, she ends up eloping with him and getting married. The third attitude toward marriage was a marriage to an elderly widow. And who married an elderly widow?

G: Hortensio.

J: Hortensio. He saw a good thing slipping away from him. He knew that he had lost Bianca, and so there was an older lady who was very interested in him who had not only her dowry, but her deceased husband's property, and she was very wealthy, and so Hortensio accepted her attention and married her. So, that attitude toward love is the marriage of convenience or greed. OK. So all three of these attitudes would have been prevalent in Shakespeare's day about marriage. Uh, #3. 'Find examples of Shakespeare's use of folklore and superstition to understand the meaning of his references. There's a reference here in Scene 2, excuse me, in Scene 1 in Act II. Katrina just has a fit about having to wait until her younger sister got married. What would happen if she, Bianca, the younger sister, got married first? Two things that the other sister would have to do? and Katrina says them. One of them has to do with being barefoot. (Observation 2/16)

This particular class was largely teacher-centered. During this class period, Joan's teaching behaviors did not correspond to her general belief in an interactive, response-centered approach to teaching literature. They did, however, support a statement she had made to me the week before. In the first interview, Joan had told me, "And
that is what teaching is all about. You disseminate information, and you hope students can do something useful with it."

This window on Joan's teaching of literature and the earlier description of her teaching of writing suggest that she takes an eclectic approach to pedagogy, choosing to be teacher-centered or to be student-centered, depending on her perception of the content and skills to be learned as well as on her read of the personality of the class.

The Need for Time to Talk

Joan has taken many graduate courses with other teachers and has an appreciation for the quality of the interaction that can go on among professional educators. Her comment at the end of the first session last fall was "Strong group dynamics -- expected of teachers" (10/26). She also feels the isolation of teaching and the lack of opportunity in the teacher's day-to-day world to have such high-quality interaction. One of her concerns noted was "Interaction between departments" (10/28). At the end of the next session, her comment was "Professional sharing -- not the norm" (11/2).

She talked with me about the value of the Project sessions in terms of time to talk with colleagues about
their work. She said,

I like the experience that I've had with this Clinical Faculty, although it's taken more of my time than I really thought that it would. But it's given teachers a time to talk to each other about their student teachers and to discuss different methods of inducting the student teacher into the school community. We sat around and talked about it, and we never do that in our profession. We never have time. Some of us from Sparta who are on the Clinical Faculty have talked about this is the first time we could remember that we sat down and discussed anything in depth about our own professions, and I think that it's been very good and one of the most positive things that we've felt about the program is that we're sitting down with other people who do the same thing. (Interview #2)

At the final session, that interaction was still salient for her. She noted that the aspect of the Project that had been most interesting to her was "Interaction with professional peers -- K to university level -- across disciplines" (5/24). Even though they had good talk in the Project sessions, it seems there was little effect on her sense of the day-to-day communication back at Sparta. In our final interview I asked Joan about her interaction this year with other Clinical Faculty members in the school. She replied, "Not a whole lot this year, because I don't see people from other departments" (Interview #4).

That Joan could not find time to talk with colleagues at school is not surprising in light of her sense that there
is never enough time to do all that must be done. For her, school is a hectic environment in which work is fragmented and subject to constant interruption. Once, when I was waiting to do our second interview, she sent word down to the Guidance Office Conference Room that she had to cancel because one of the computers had malfunctioned and she had to retrieve a paper for a student. Later, when we did that interview, she told me how difficult a time she was having finding time to talk with Betty, "Our time frames, every one of them gets undone because something will come up, just as mine did with this particular meeting last week, and so I had to cancel" (Interview #2).

She went on to explain,

There's not enough time in the day. I have a hard time finding time to talk to her because I have two periods that I am a tutor in the Writing Center and we can't plan to use any of that, because there are always students who need help, and that's why I am there. And, then, my planning period, most of the time, isn't...because I have things that I have to do and so I just need more time with her. (Interview #2)

She noted that this year had been no different from previous years. In the past, Joan talked with her student teachers "whenever we could do it, because of the kind of schedule I have (Interview #2).

At the end of the second round of interviews, I had asked each of the teachers working with me to tape 15-minute
samples of their talk with their student teachers once a week for the remainder of the term. Joan and the others all agreed to do so. Her hectic schedule became a problem, however. In mid-March, when I asked her how that task was progressing, she replied, "Time. It is almost impossible to fit that in. Today, my student teacher and I know we have to do it because we have not had five minutes with each other without interruptions all week to get that done" (Interview #3).

She went on to tell me about how she was structuring the taped talk with Betty. They had taken Joan's written notes on several day's lessons -- notes about topics that they had already discussed. For the tape, they were looking at "strands" of the same problem across time. They had only taped once when we did the third interview. Joan explained,

We talk all the time about individual things, but, uh, I save -- very artificially and very frankly -- I save that kind of conversation for your tape, so you can hear it. And I had hoped I'd get another one done today. If not, it'll be next Tuesday before I get to it because I won't be here on Monday. I don't mind doing the tape. It's just that with my schedule, it's just almost impossible for us to find time to do it together. (Interview #3)

In the end, she recorded only one session with Betty -- on March 7. In the last interview, she told me that they couldn't find definite times to sit down and have
conversations for your tape. Never did get that part of it done, because of interruptions in my day, and her day, and my family problems, and my being in and out."

Awareness of time, concern for lack of time, and frustration with interruptions permeate Joan's talk about her work. She found Analysis Task 2 to be "Time-consuming" (12/9).

**Managing the Classroom Environment**

In the classroom, Joan is concerned about academic learning time and a learning environment free from disruption. One of the concerns she listed was "Time on task; accomplishing the SOLs (Standards of Learning)" (10/28). The first "strand" that she and Betty focused on in the conference that they taped was Betty's classroom management and getting the class started at the beginning -- i.e. time on task (3/7). Joan told of a situation when she gave suggestions to Betty on how to proceed when the class was not responding,

And I told her how to regroup and regroup until she found the right combination. And there were times when I sat in the room, I just felt that for my taste it was too noisy. I just didn't think they were doing as much as they should have. The hardest thing for her in teaching is coming down hard on kids when they need discipline. (Interview #4)
In their taped conference, Joan praised Betty for the way she had handled an incident in one of the Honors English 10 classes. She told her, "I thought to ignore it was the best method that you could've done. I don't think she realized she was being rude, but she was, but you didn't interrupt the attention span of the other twenty-four students by stopping. I thought you did the right thing" (3/7).

When she described the interaction in the two written cases, Joan praised one of the teachers for fostering "appropriate classroom behavior" and her "consistency of discipline." She criticized the other for having "poor discipline techniques" (10/28).

Joan talked with me about one of her students who caused disruption in the classroom.

I have a student that I don't particularly enjoy working with that has this... behavior problem and nothing that I seem to do -- positives, negatives, neutral -- with the student makes any difference in his behavior patterns. He is doing the same thing in all his classes. He's not very receptive of me or my student teacher or to any other teacher in the school, and I get no positive feedback from him that he's gaining anything from what I do. All I see is negative behavior patterns, and I don't enjoy working with him. (Interview 63)

The next time we talked, the situation had changed. Joan said,

The management of our class is certainly somewhat different than it was the last time I spoke about it. It was rather difficult to
manage at that point, but I have had so many of the problem students drop out, and they are no longer with me that the whole character of the class is different from what it was when I talked about it. So... yes, my management style is different now because I don't have the problems that I dealt with before. Still have some, but I can work more closely one-on-one without the rest of the class bouncing off of the walls.
(Interview #4)

When I asked her what she should have liked for Betty to be able to do better by the end of student teaching, she again mentioned classroom management. She said that she would have liked for her to

Be very, very firm with those students, and expecting ...uh, behavior appropriate to the situation, and following through on her handling of a problem, and not letting it get to a point that it is difficult to handle. She is so kind and so giving, and... not as naive as she was in that you can't expect students to do exactly what you want just because you're nice to them. And I think she has seen that light. She did get an awfully lot better. And that is really the only thing that I had a concern. She is very knowledgeable; she has got more ideas than I have ever seen in a student teacher of ways to present, to evaluate, to handle the material in a classroom, and the only one drawback was this business of her assertiveness with different kinds of students. And it is better, much better in the end. (Interview #4)

Thus, Joan expects of her student teacher what she expects of herself: full use of the entire class period and a learning environment free from disruption.
Joan Brinkley and the Clinical Faculty Project

Joan Brinkley valued the interchange in the Clinical Faculty Project sessions and came to believe that such an experience should be had by all cooperating teachers. In some ways, however, she viewed her own role in the Project more as a giver than as a receiver.

The Project Discussion Sessions

Joan Brinkley acknowledged few connections between the Project discussion sessions and her work with her student teacher because, in her view, she already had been doing most of what was discussed in the sessions.

Sensitivity to Needs and Perspectives. Much of the information already presented suggests that Joan Brinkley is sensitive to the needs and perspectives of her students, and that she has been throughout her teaching career. She is concerned about students' problems and whether or not she is doing all she can to prepare them for the future. In early February, she told me,

This is one of the most stressful professions that I know of because I take -- not just me -- teachers take things home with them. They take their work home with them; they take student problems home with them. And it is almost impossible to escape unless you are totally uncaring. The kids today have so many very complicated situations and problems. And they are most willing to bring
them to school and to share with teachers, because many times they don't have anyone at home to share with. So we become not only teachers, but counselors. Some days I feel like I do nothing but counsel. I am teaching in 1988 and basically my education was back in the '60s. My concern is that I constantly need to be out there, updating my own knowledge and trying to anticipate what skills, language arts skills, particularly. I'm interested in the skills they will need in the year 2000. It is scary to think that you are teaching skills that they are going to be using 20 years from now, and you don't know what is out there and the world's changing so fast, and especially with this information society that we are involved in.

Even though she is frustrated with the challenges presented to her by her ninth graders, she tries to structure learning activities that they will enjoy. She also talked with Betty about the life perspective of many of those ninth graders.

Often in that class we read simple plays out loud. They are happy; they want to play the parts; they want to be a role model. So those two activities were successful, and I felt good about that, but trying to find things that they want to do -- that they will behave, and do something successful is, is hard to do, but they did like that fingerprint design. And they saw the creative writing folders that my honors class had designed, and they have begged to do that. That is an assignment that...I asked my honors students to design their folders in an extension of their personality, and it is part of their 35 assignments that go into it. And so I decided that I will let these students try too. Usually what they write creatively is very, very negative. I am not sure what I am going to get, but I let them do the folders. My student teacher came in
the other day, and she was helping me with them. She said, "Have you looked to see what these ninth graders are writing?" Well, I had, I had seen some, but I hadn't seen many of the paragraphs yet. I was letting her work with the students who were ahead of the rest of them, and she said, "Look how negative they are." And she said, "Now you look at the honors folders and read what they wrote and see how positive their attitudes are" which is not surprising to me. I mean these kids have had negative feedback all of their lives. And that is what they give out.

(Interview #1)

Sometimes Joan's sensitivity to student needs results in action on her part. She described the situation of one young man whom she believed had been wrongly placed into her Special Materials section.

He's two years older than the rest of the ninth graders. He's not the problem that I anticipated from his folder, and he is much more mature than the rest of the students. He needs the kind of attention that I'm trying to give him, because his peer group is so much younger and immature. I have seen it with documented letters to his guidance counselor that he is no longer placed in Special Materials English classes. He doesn't need to be there. His scores are too high. I don't know why he was ever placed there in the first place, and I got him out of there. I enjoy working with him. He will do well in a regular class. And he does not work well with the peer group he is with in that Special Materials class. He doesn't have to work, and he doesn't. So we changed it.

(Interview #3)

Joan believes that she has been sensitive to the needs and perspectives of her student teachers as well. In the
initial session, she wrote, "Good cooperating teacher is sensitive to needs, fears of the student teacher" (10/26). She told me of a previous student teacher who had arrived one afternoon with her supervisor with no advance notification from officials at State, and how bad she felt that she was unable to stay after school that day to get acquainted with her. "It made her feel awful. I didn't know it at the time. We talked about it and laughed about it later, but she said she went home and cried her eyes out because this is a horrible way to start an experience you are going to have" (Interview #2).

Joan attributed her sensitivity to student teachers to remembering her own student teaching experience which was a very negative one. She explained,

I am glad I have student teachers because my student teaching experience in North Carolina was so bad that I almost did not go into this profession, and I know from experience what a miserable time it can be if the situation is not good. I don't think I learned anything that year except how to survive, and so that has always been in the back of my mind when I get a new student teacher. I always think I want this to be a positive experience to you. I want you to love teaching as much as I do. (Interview #1)

Although she had attended the meeting where Project members were asked to think back on their own student teaching, Joan did not make any direct link here, implying that she had long been mindful of the effect of her own negative
experience on her attitude. That day, she had written as an implication of her remembering, that cooperating teachers should be "empathetic to the student teacher's personal life" (1/11).

Planned, Intentional Orientation. When asked what she had done to orient previous student teachers to the classroom, she said,

Pretty much the same thing that I've done this year. My first goal is to get, get them to know the students -- right off the bat. First day. Start making introductions. I want the student teachers to feel that they are part of the school community, and I want the, the students to know them. To me it's very, very important for the students to establish a good rapport with the student teacher. Because we have so many student teachers at this school, somehow the students get -- it's sort of a game of one-upmanship, and I don't want that kind of competitive atmosphere. And I don't have it either.

I followed, asking if there were other things that she had done in the past to facilitate student teachers' induction.

She continued,

I can't really say that I've done a whole lot different in the past, because I do, I routinely do these things. It's just part of my style in the way that I orient them. I do it a little bit at a time, and it's a long time before I ever let them alone in a classroom. (Interview #2)

I then asked directly if she perceived herself to have been a contributor to the Project discussion on orientation and whether, in fact, she had a sense that she had helped others
who, perhaps, had not done those things in the past. She smiled and said, "Yes" (Interview #2).

Her description of the procedures she used to introduce Betty to the school were similar to what many of the Project members described having done when they returned for the January 18 session. For example, she prioritized some of the reading so as not to overwhelm Betty with information she would not need right away. On February 21, she said,

I immediately introduced her to students, because students are around me all the time by virtue of my being Director of Writing Center, and so she needed to see me in a situation where I never had any peace at all and no time to myself. And she got to know the students quickly. I had two of them take her on an hour's tour and I did not do that. I wanted the students to do that because she would be with me throughout the school plant enough, and I wanted her to see it from their perspective. So, we did that. I had some things gathered together for her to read. I didn't give her all of the manuals and all of the things that we did at one time, but I did give her at least three things to read and to take home with her after that first day. She attended all of my classes. She and I discussed what I teach and how much she thought that she might be willing to take on of my subject matter load because it was a matter of whether she took two honors classes and one other preparation, either humanities or a special materials class, or whether she wanted a sampling of all and have three preparations. And we discussed that, and she saw the different kinds of activities that I did.... We talked about, ah, such mundane things as how to get here on time from State, how long it would take and, and, ah, where she should park and just a lot of housekeeping things. It was a pretty good question and answer session. I let her
pretty much let me know what she wanted to know the first day.

In March, after she had described to me how she had structured the taped conferences with Betty, using the observation notes from several days' lessons and then focusing on "strands" across time, I asked if she had ever used that strategy before. She indicated that she had not. Then, I suggested to her that perhaps she had developed that strategy in response to my intervention. She replied,

I didn't do it differently because you asked me to do it. I did it differently because I just decided, without any prompting from you all, that I wanted to try this method and see if it worked. And I like the interaction that she and I have, being able to look at more than one observation of mine of her at a time. (Interview #3)

When asked whether any of the Project discussions had any link to her work with her student teacher this year, she sighed and said that the "Remembering Student Teaching" task had caused her to be more sensitive.

Student Teaching as a Developmental Process. Joan Brinkley talked about student teaching as a learning experience but did not make explicit references to the developmental phases that she believed student teachers pass through. Embedded in her description of the things she had Betty do early on, however, were phrases that suggested that
she sees the process as developmental. She said, "She began the first week to do little things" and "I'm doing it one class at a time." She also explained, "My philosophy is that we work as a team for a long time and then eventually she will have the students by herself." Other such implicit references included, "She's just learning"; "a long time before. . ." (Interview #2); "talk about her progress" (Interview #3); and "She progressed a lot" (Interview #2).

Although the above comments and implicit references suggest her awareness of the developmental nature of student teaching, her lack of explicit comments about developmental phases may be explained by her absence from two of the Project sessions. The small group English - Social Studies meeting in February was cancelled due to bad weather. Joan was absent from the February large group meeting and then did not receive word of when the make-up small group meeting was to be held. Thus, she did not attend a Clinical Faculty Project session between January 18 and March 7. On February 22, the large secondary group began attempting to describe developmental stages that student teachers pass through. On February 27, the entire English - Social Studies session was devoted to developmental phases.
The "Thinking About Teaching" and Other Tasks

Joan noted that distinguishing between observations and judgments was something that she had always done in her role as a cooperating teacher. I asked if she could make any connection between the Project task relating to observations and judgments and her work with Betty.

To be honest with you, no, I cannot because that task that we did in those sessions with the Clinical Faculty was something very familiar to me because I have done so much conferencing with teachers when I worked in the city school system because of the position that I had as co-chairman of the English Department and the task that I was assigned to do in observing and conferencing with teachers. So what we did in that session was not new to me. And so I can't make an honest statement to you on this tape that I can connect that session with my student teacher. I can connect what I have done in my previous teaching experience with my student teacher, yes.

I then asked if the two terms ever came up in her work with Betty. She continued,

I use the terms in talking to her. I do observations of her and I make judgments of her work with students, and she and I are very clear on the terminology used in what is a judgment and what is an observation. And I get her to do that with her students particularly with my slow class when I'm trying to get her to individualize her instruction and meet the needs of those students who are very difficult to work with. Observations and judgments is a big part of what she and I do together -- on two levels -- me with her as her supervising teacher and her with her students. Would you like me to give you an example of what she has done?
I'll give you an example of something she and I have observed in the judgments that she makes that I concur with. She has a particularly difficult problem -- and so do I -- with a student who is Attention Deficit. And, no matter what we seem to do with him in a classroom -- where we put him, what kinds of activities that we do -- he is always in our judgment disruptive. So I have had her observe and make reference of his behavior, and we have tried to catalog his behavior to see what he does in different situations -- where he sits in the room, what kind of activities he's involved in and when he seems to be more focal and more detached from any kind of learning situation. And then we have made observations and cataloged them. And then we have made judgments about this child and what we are going to eventually do about him. (Interview #3)

In the final interview, I asked whether her ways of communicating her judgments to this student teacher had been different from ways she had given feedback in the past. She responded immediately, "No." When I asked her to recall the two students she had focused on for her mini-case studies in doing Analysis Task 1 in November, she said, "I can't even bring it back. I can't. I don't know which ones I used" (Interview #3).

I then asked her to say something about her insights, gains, or other outcomes from Analysis Task 2. She described what she had done.

What I chose to tape was a lesson that I taught in the Writing Center. It's a small group of students -- on the basics of word processing. I had hoped to use that tape as a model for other students who came in for assistance at the Writing Center when I was
not there and had other assignments and was not on duty as a tutor. I found the tape very successful in that I accomplished what I set out to do with the students who were in there at the time. The tape was a failure for use with other students, and I realized I couldn't do that because it has to be a one-on-one thing. What I said to the students there at that session does not apply, would not apply to other students who came in there without me. It just didn't work. I was working with four students at the time, and I was working with them at four computers and giving instructions, giving feedback, giving guided practice with them. I didn't learn a lot from that except that I can't use the tape for a different group of students.

(Interview #3)

She had taped a lesson. She had listened to it. She had "studied her teaching." When I asked if there was any link between that task and her work with her student teacher, the answer was, "No" (Interview #3).

Later in that same interview, I asked her to recall the list of characteristics generated by Project members at the final session -- characteristics a good Clinical Faculty member would have. I asked her whether there were any qualities on that list that she felt she did not have. She replied, "Well, let's see. It may be patience."

I probed again, saying, "My question is, did that listing cause you any concern? That uh, it may be something you need to think about or work on more." She replied,

I think the listing made me, it did one thing for me. I've done a lot of sharing with teachers who are on the Clinical Faculty, whereas, normally I would not have talked
with them. We're a closer group to discuss how we're doing and how our student teachers are doing. (Interview #3)

I asked her to recall the "Concerns Task" in which we listed our concerns as experienced teachers and compared them to what we thought might be the concerns of a student teacher. Then, I asked if anything from that task had come back to play a part in her work with her student teacher.

The concerns of a student teachers are her expectations for herself are very high. She's very concerned about getting everything done -- you know, her teaching techniques. She's more apprehensive than a seasoned teacher would be. I try to deal with her apprehension and make her feel as comfortable as possible in a situation as she can.

I asked if that was any different from the way she had worked with student teachers in the past. Her response was an acknowledgement that the Project may have had an effect on the way she approached her work with her student teacher this year. She said, "I am more aware of it than probably I was before, yes" (Interview #3).

Although Joan was not always ready to describe her critical analysis of her teaching or the supervision of her student teacher this year, it is interesting to note that when asked in early November if she had any comment about her involvement in the Project at that time, she wrote, "Self-Analysis" (11/2).
Communicating with a Student Teacher

Throughout the student teaching term, Joan and Betty struggled to find time to communicate with each other about their work with their students. Initially, Joan gave Betty her carefully considered written comments on her lessons. Gradually, the written response fell away as they moved to talking with each other when they had the opportunity. They were not able to establish specific times for conferring about Betty's teaching.

Moving from Written to Oral Feedback. Citing the problems they had finding time to confer with each other during the day, in our second interview, Joan said, "We end up writing each other notes." She continued, "I have observed her teaching, and after I do that, I let it settle in my own mind, and I go home and I think it over, and then I write her notes -- extensive written notes on what I perceived to be going on in her classroom."

When I asked if Betty wrote back, if it had become a written dialogue, she clarified, "She hasn't written back so much yet. Mostly, we've talked back, and she doesn't have time to write back." In that same interview, she indicated that she had not had any written dialogue with previous student teachers.
In the third interview, Joan said that in the past she had given written feedback to her student teachers and then they had talked about it much the same as she and Betty were doing. Between the two interviews, Joan attended a secondary large group session in which the topics were various structures for written feedback and the importance of early written feedback.

In the final interview, she noted that she had started out giving written feedback to Betty, but that lack of time caused her to discontinue it. She lamented, "I wrote. I used to write all of it down. I don't anymore. I just can't find the time."

When I probed, she clarified that she believes that written feedback is important early on in the term, and that in the past she had given written feedback, but "Not as much as I did this year, and then I gave it up this time, too. There just wasn't time to do it. And we were, we were doing better talking to each other. It was just as effective."

"Constant Communication." Joan believes that good communication is important. One of her concerns as a teacher is "Open communication with parents" (10/28). A characteristic she deems necessary to effectively working with a student teacher is to be a "Good listener" (5/24). She described her communication with her student teacher
this year as "...constant. Every day was a constant conversation -- everywhere we went about little details that she wanted feedback on" (Interview #4). Once, when Betty needed to talk at length, Joan responded to her need.

She knew we needed to talk about it. She felt like she had completely failed in 2 days when the class just really got out of hand. And, it was wanting to do something about it, and having to sit down and having to talk about it, and having to work at it, and having to try to find a solution to it. And once we did, it was over just like that. (Interview #4)

In the conference that they taped, as they went over Joan's written notes about the past few days' lessons, looking at "strands," Joan frequently gave judgments about a particular strategy or response. Even though they had been over the comments previously, Betty appeared uncertain as to what Joan really thought. Betty asked several perception-checking questions: "Oh, so you thought I did the right thing?"; "You thought that wasn't incredibly disruptive to the class?"; "Oh, so that's good?"; "Uh, I hope this isn't bad..."; and "Did you feel that day that I was, pretty much keeping people down at the beginning?"

Joan had indicated that this conference was artificial and not representative of their typical talk. In that they had been over the notes before, perhaps Betty was simply giving a response that she thought appropriate. It may be
that Betty is, in Joan's words, "the kind of person that has a need for and a desire to talk out every single thing, every item" (Interview #4) and that is why she checks Joan's perceptions.

**Becoming a Teacher Educator**

Joan's response to the first year of the Project was a positive one. Prior to her involvement in it, she had both specific and general concerns about the communication gap between higher education and the public schools. Although she came to the Project with very positive feelings about her work with student teachers, she seems to have experienced an increase in self-efficacy as a teacher educator through her participation in it.

**The Role as Project Member**

Joan made reference to herself as a Project member frequently, using such phrases as, "these teacher sessions"; "this kind of experience that we're now involved in"; "these Clinical Faculty sessions"; some of us from Sparta of the Clinical Faculty" (Interview #2); "in the Clinical Faculty group last week"; "a teacher who is not in our Clinical Faculty"; and "see what we are getting paid to do" (Interview #4). She also noted that her principal "is happy
with what's going on here and would prefer all teachers to do this" (English - Social Studies Session 4/13).

She found the Project helpful and was aware of its collaborative structure. She told me,

I hope some of our suggestions that we're making in these Clinical Faculty sessions will, indeed, mold this program. I mean the colleges say that it will, and they say that we're, you know, designing what we want this to be as we go along. I hope it really is going to be the case, and I think we've done some really good thinking about our own teaching from all of this, and how we deal with the student teachers. (Interview #2)

She enjoyed the discussion of outcomes from that task.

Listening to our group discussion that day we had all come back with audio tapes and video tapes, and discussing how we looked as we listened to ourselves -- and how we acted to students, and how much time we spent on activities. That turned out to be absolutely -- and in some cases hilarious -- and was real interesting. I haven't sat down and looked at myself for a long time in a critical fine ear and to have us discuss that and sit around and joke and ... how silly some of the things that occurred were and how we really need to be very careful about just structuring our lessons tight enough or not racing through something that you maybe give students no thinking time. (Interview #2)

Indeed, it was just such sharing that offered to Joan a refreshing contrast to her hectic, fragmented days at Sparta High School where she spends her time regulating the constant flow of student traffic that surrounds her, never
finding time for extended dialogue with any of her colleagues.

Closing the Communication Gap

Joan Brinkley voiced her general concern about a gap in communication between higher education and the public schools when project participants were encouraged to remember their own student teaching and/or experiences with previous student teachers. One of her implications was "Improve lines of Communication between the college and the Clinical Faculty" (1/11). Specific concerns included not having been notified in advance when her last student teacher came from State (Interview #2) and wanting to get to know the student teacher better before the beginning of the term (1/18).

In the second interview, she expressed that frustration and her hope for the future.

Historically, we have had very little contact -- except for the supervising teacher -- with the colleges. And, there has not been that much coordination. There is now for some of us. I'm of the opinion that all [cooperating teachers] should have this kind of experience we're now involved in. We have never had such close communication with the college faculty, and I really don't think the colleges have known some of our concerns or really actually have known what we've done with student teachers in the past.
Joan believes that her approach to supervision is different from that of the university, especially in the area of planning. She believes that the university demands too much detail to be written, and she would prefer to have the responsibility of teaching the student teacher to plan for teaching left up to her. She described the differences.

I took out my plan book and showed her how I keep it. I showed her unit plans that I did. I talked to her about how to write goals and objectives and activities. I showed her how I put together an entire unit in creative writing, which she will be a part of, in the honors class. We talked extensively about what to do in a humanities class where we have no textbook, where the world is our textbook and how we gather information and put it together and how we try to use concepts and then find material to fit into the goals that we set up. She modeled her first unit of study with my ninth grade students very closely after one that I had showed her, and it's not exactly the way that State had taught these student teachers in their methods class a way of doing it, and we discussed how I do mine and how State wants that done. The first week she was overwhelmed because her lesson plans were rejected. She had to do 'em all over for State, and that's one of the things that we have brought up in our sessions, these teacher sessions, about what kind of expectations that these student teachers are going to have with the way that we do lesson plans and the way that the colleges want them. And I thought we had come to an agreement, but apparently we have not. And I don't want the student teachers overwhelmed and spend all their time writing lesson plans. I think that the student teachers that I see, the two in the English department are not showing a lot of frustration except with the massive amount of paper work that they're doing. They seem to be adjusting
very well with what we're doing, what we're doing here, and I guess that the sheer mountain of paper work really concerns me. (Interview #2)

I asked her if she would like to find some way to get a message to the university faculty to let them know that she believed their student teachers had too much paper work. She replied,

Yes, I would. I see absolute necessity for extensive plans, but I just feel like that they spend too much time writing down every single activity and all of the ideas that they might say in a classroom, and it just isn't realistic to think that we work that way. And it cuts down the time that she has to prepare because she's teaching two things for me that she has not taught before.

She also criticized the university supervisor indirectly when she told me about how carefully she went over Betty's written plans. She said,

I evaluated very carefully her short term plans, and all of her long term plans and all of her daily lesson plans, and all of her notes that she used. She is a very meticulous person, having everything written down, as far as her plans are concerned. And she wanted me to go over in detail, because she felt like I was the only one making extensive comments on plans that she did for the university -- which I did. (Interview #4)

Joan also seemed pleased to be able to quote Betty as having said to her after a conversation about her needing to be more assertive. "She said to me, 'I am glad you said this
to me rather than having my supervisor say this. It is easier coming from you." (Interview #4).

Another difference that she noted with the university supervisor was with regard to evaluating the student teacher, "when he comes to observe he is looking for different things that I am not conscious of every day" (Interview #4).

Although she has been concerned about lack of communication among the participants in the student teaching program in the past, she hopes that this Project and another one in which she has been involved will address the communication issue. I had asked in our second interview if anything else had informed her work with her student teacher. She replied,

I guess one other activity I'm doing -- it doesn't have anything to do.... Yes it does, too. It does have something to do particularly with this. I am on the Teacher Education Committee at State. I'm the only secondary school teacher on it. There's one superintendent and me. And the rest of them are faculty, and I'm getting an inside look at the other flip side of the coin of what the State Department of Education has demanded that [teacher preparation] schools do and how they're struggling with that and how the whole subject of a major in education is changing and what the schools have got to do and how the public school system is suppose to communicate with the college on that. I think that the subcommittee that I'm on is to investigate communication with the school systems. And all this is tied together, and making me see what we've got to
do with student teachers, and I just have a feeling that we're going to have to work harder if we don't get them in the school of education as a major and then they major in something else -- in another discipline -- and then, I'm not sure how the recruiting is going to work. It bothers me that we're going so fast in this direction in that by 19, I believe it's 92, this has got to be in place everywhere, in each school. We're working on better communication with the schools. My subcommittee has not met yet. Dr. Nelson and I are on it, and I wrote him a letter inviting him to come meet, but he hasn't answered me. So, I don't know what we're going to come up with. I do know that this particular subcommittee is something he is very interested in and is doing a lot of work in, so when I get a chance to talk to him I want to know more about that.

(Interview #2)

Joan Brinkley was very aware of the need for improved communication between the institutions at the various levels in education when she entered the Project; she had already been enlisted in the efforts toward change.

**Self-Efficacy as a Teacher Educator**

In addition to having added to her first-hand knowledge of the need for better relations among those involved with preparing teachers, serving on the Teacher Education committee at State and participating in the Clinical Faculty Project may have contributed to her sense of herself as a teacher educator. When she listed the implications that emerged when she thought about her previous experiences with
student teaching, Joan wrote, "Clarify for ourselves and for our student teacher what our role is" (1/11). Evidence has been presented that she perceives herself to be clear about her own role with student teachers and that she believes she is effective in that role.

Her sense of self-efficacy as a teacher educator has been affirmed this year by positive feedback she has gotten from Betty. Joan took pride in telling me, "She has told me that she thought my suggestions were very workable" and "I think that just watching me has helped her in dealing with students. She says that it has" (Interview #2).

Joan has concerns about the preparation of teachers, however, that go beyond her immediate context. She has thoughts about how the system can be improved and, to some extent, a sense of what she can do to bring about those changes. As noted above, she is aware of the impact of political decisions on the recruitment of prospective teachers. She recognizes the far-reaching implications of the recent state legislation that did away with the elementary education major at the university. She said,

Well, they're not to take more than eighteen [hours] now in this new program, and they have to major in something else besides education with a couple of exceptions that the state department has allowed. That has bearing on the whole system -- how many people we lose or whatever -- in the elementary level. That's why I am interested in all of this. (Interview #2)
She has thought about how the Project might help with recruitment of prospective teachers. She told me, "We're trying to come up with a more refined, better, more rewarding procedure for student teachers and hope that they will encourage more of them to go in the profession" (Interview #2).

She has recommendations about the nature and length of field experiences for the beginner.

I think that in the educating of future teachers we need to have them more out in the classroom than ever before, and I am hoping that the committee I am on at State right now about teacher education will produce some strong suggestions about getting student teachers out in the schools more than just their senior year. (Interview #1)

She also is dissatisfied with the form that the university has cooperating teachers fill out for the summative evaluation of the performance of student teachers and would like to participate in revising it. "I would like to revise the form. It is in sad need of revision. When we start working on it, if, indeed, State will change it, I think we need to see more, because there are a lot of things on the Highlands one that are not addressed on this State one" (Interview #4).

Joan Brinkley believes that she is effective in working with the beginners who are assigned to her. She has long
been concerned about improving communication among those responsible for preparing future teachers. This year, she believes she is involved in bringing about needed change.

Conclusion

Joan Brinkley is a dedicated professional educator who has a well-defined sense of self both as a teacher and as a teacher educator. She is conscientious in her preparation for teaching, always wanting to know more and to find better ways to know. She is sensitive to the needs of her students and values her development of lasting friendships with many of them. For Joan, school is a demanding place where there is never enough time to do all that she wants and needs to do, including finding time to talk with other teachers.

Although she believed that she was already doing many of the suggestions that came out of the Project sessions, she had a positive attitude toward the Clinical Faculty Project. Perhaps the greatest value of the Project for her was in the opportunity it afforded her to have professional dialogue with colleagues from Sparta and other area schools.

Although Joan made little connection between the Project tasks and discussion sessions and changes in her own work with her student teacher, she saw the Clinical Faculty Project as effective in closing the communication gap
between higher education and the public schools. With the improved communication, she hopes many of her concerns about the preparation of future teachers will be addressed and resolved.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION OF THE CASES AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents a discussion of findings from the four case studies and raises questions suggested by them. It also includes implications for collaborative approaches to inservice education and suggestions for further research. The organization of the chapter is similar to that of each of the case studies, which were shaped by the research questions.

Professional Biographies

All four of the teachers who served as informants in this study teach at the same high school. They represent a variety of subject areas, including Spanish, mathematics, earth science, and English. All are veteran teachers; they range from having sixteen to thirty-two years of teaching experience. Each was selected for participation in the Project because she is considered to be a good teacher by her superordinates and by faculty members from higher education. Each has had experience in working with student teachers in the past.
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Views of Teaching and Learning

Discussion

All four of the case study informants place a great deal of emphasis on effective management of their classrooms. They strive for order and control of the learning environment. They cite organization and planning as being key elements in good teaching. Perhaps this emphasis on order is related to their view of school as a hectic environment where the work is fragmented and fraught with frequent interruptions -- a view held by all, but articulated most frequently and most forcefully by Donna Matthews, the math teacher, and Joan Brinkley, the English teacher.

All four of these teachers, especially Janet Harmon, the science teacher, and Joan Brinkley, indicated that they believe students learn through modeling and that student teachers learn to teach through modeling. Three of the four (Donna Matthews, Janet Harmon, and Joan Brinkley) had difficulties in communicating with their student teachers concerns about classroom management.

Implications

In the hectic environment of school, there is little time for talk with colleagues or reflection on practice.
Teachers make hundreds of decisions every day (Bird and Little, 1976; Lortie, 1975), and move through the teaching day in relative isolation from their adult co-workers (Lortie, 1975; McPherson, 1972). Perhaps one way that veteran teachers have learned to cope is by establishing order and by developing routines that lead to their maintaining control of the classroom environment.

Initially their student teachers benefit from coming into that controlled situation because they do not have to be concerned about classroom management and can focus on their teaching. The expectation is, however, that they will be able to maintain that level of organization. When they cannot, tensions arise between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher.

Further research is indicated to determine whether the three teachers whose student teachers had problems with management are representative of the population of teachers considered to be effective as cooperating teachers with respect to their need for order and control. Do teachers who themselves have high need for classroom order tend to see their student teachers as needing to develop better techniques for classroom management?

In addition, follow-up studies will be needed to determine whether similar concerns arise with other student
teachers placed with each of these cooperating teachers. That is, do these three teachers generally tend to see their student teachers as needing to improve their discipline in the classroom? If so, continued dialogue with other cooperating teachers could be helpful as they worked with their awareness of that pattern.

Follow-up studies are also indicated to determine the extent to which this Project has lasting effects on the approaches of these four teachers toward their supervision of student teachers. Will they continue to use strategies discussed in the Project sessions to deal with future student teachers? Will they continue to be sensitive to the perspectives of their student teachers? Will they continue to plan systematically for orientation of the student teacher? Will they continue to view student teaching as a developmental process?

Finally, as noted above, the importance of the cooperating teacher's influence on the student teacher (Tabachnick, 1980) and the influence of cooperating teachers as a normative group (Haberman, 1978) have been established. If effective teaching is learned by the student teacher's observing the modeling of good teaching, as both the research and these four Project teachers indicate, then it is imperative that colleges and universities preparing
future teachers identify cooperating teachers to work in the clinical setting who are themselves excellent teachers and who are able to model their thinking about their teaching for the beginner. Because little is known about how master teachers transmit their knowledge about teaching and learning to the beginner, further research is needed which focuses on how cooperating teachers might transform what they know so that it is accessible to the beginner.

**Participation in the Clinical Faculty Project**

**The Project Sessions**

In my analysis of the data from the four cases, three topics of concern emerged as important from the Phase II discussion sessions. The topics were (1) developing sensitivity to the needs and perspectives of the student teacher; (2) approaching the induction of the student teacher with an organized plan; and (3) looking at the student teaching experience as a developmental process.

**Discussion**

**Sensitivity to Needs, Perspectives.** All four of the informants recognized that they had become more empathetic to their student teachers after placing themselves in the position of the student teacher. Carmen Sparks and Donna
Matthews made direct links to the "Remembering Student Teaching" task they did in one of the January meetings. Janet Harmon thought about how she felt at the beginning of a new year, especially in a new context. Joan Brinkley indicated that she had already been aware of how difficult a time she had had in her student teaching and had become more sensitive as a result.

**Planned, Intentional Orientation.** Three of the four made direct links between this year's carefully planned induction of the student teacher and the Project discussions about preparing for the student teacher's arrival as being like doing a lesson plan for teaching. Carmen Sparks noted that this year she did not "fly by the seat of [her] pants" as she had in the past. Donna Matthews set priorities for what her student teacher should read first, second, and so on. Janet Harmon noted that the way she had oriented the student teacher in the past "seems ridiculous" now. Joan Brinkley did many of the activities that the others did but stated that she had been carrying out such activities in her previous work with student teachers.

**Student Teaching as a Developmental Process.** In three of the four cases, there is evidence that the Clinical Faculty member gained an awareness that student teachers experience growth across time. Carmen Sparks was able to
make explicit her implicit sense of the three phases she sees the beginner passing through. Donna Matthews talked of her student teacher's having moved "over the threshold." Janet Harmon indicated an awareness of the developmental nature of student teaching but saw so little growth in her current student teacher that the concept of growth across time did not appear in her talk about him. Perhaps because Joan Brinkley missed two of the sessions where the focus was on a discussion of developmental growth, there was little in her comments that related to student teaching as developmental.

Implications

For Inservice in Clinical Supervision. All three of the above topics from the Phase II discussions -- sensitivity, intentional orientation, and developmental stages -- have implications for anyone considering inservice to develop the abilities of a classroom teacher to serve in the role of clinical professor (Kaslov, 1976). First, it is important to sensitize the clinical teacher to the needs and perspectives of the beginner, as the "Remembering Student Teaching" task appears to have done. When cooperating teachers are asked to remember their own student teaching and/or times when they have been in new situations, they are
more likely to realize that the student teaching experience can be overwhelming, and they are more likely to be empathetic toward the beginner. A result of that newfound empathy is that they tend to plan more carefully so that the beginner will not be overwhelmed.

It follows also that it is important for cooperating teachers to talk with colleagues about ways to plan for the systematic orientation of the student teacher to the classroom and school community. For the teachers in these cases, that intentionality of approach appears to have carried over into other areas of their work with their beginners. In addition to making specific plans for their student teachers' induction, they developed other specific strategies for working with them, including closer work with their planning for instruction and new ways of giving oral and written feedback to them.

Finally, anyone planning inservice in clinical supervision should consider facilitating among cooperating teachers thought and discussion about the developmental stages they perceive student teachers to pass through. It is important to note here that cooperating teachers should not be given a list of developmental stages to learn and to monitor, but rather they should work to create such lists for themselves and be provided time to compare their lists
with those of their colleagues. Their participation as action researchers on the student teaching experience rather than the receivers of top-down inservice training in supervision is more likely to result in their owning the learning rather than their resisting it (Day, 1987).

For Further Research. Follow-up research in this area might involve checking for evidence indicating to what extent the informants' experiences with these three topics is representative of the experience of the other teachers who participated in the Clinical Faculty Project. All the teachers serving as cooperating teachers for the college and university could be surveyed to determine the extent to which each of them is sensitive to the needs and perspectives of their student teachers, the extent to which they plan for the systematic induction of their student teachers, and the extent to which they view student teaching as a developmental process. Survey responses of those in the Project could be compared to those of non-Clinical Faculty cooperating teachers. The administering of such a survey over time and accompanying follow-up studies to determine the number of student teachers of each group who remain in teaching could offer a long-range perspective on outcomes from the Project.
A closer look at three of these cases is also indicated. Subsequent interviews with Janet Harmon as she works with a student teacher who does not have the personal limitations that Greg had could reveal whether she does, indeed, view student teaching as developmental even though she did not witness much growth over time with Greg. Follow-up interviews with Carmen and Donna are also indicated to determine whether their awareness of the concept of growth over time continues to be viable in their work with student teachers when they no longer have the opportunity to talk about those stages with colleagues.

The Thinking about Teaching Task

In addition to the above discussion topics, one Project task from Phase I appears to have had a marked impact on three of the four case study informants. That task led the three to reconsider their implicit understanding of the terms observation and judgment. Differentiating between these two terms and the behaviors that they associate with the two terms allowed the three informants to approach supervision of this year's student teacher differently from the way they had in the past.
Discussion

Differentiating Observations and Judgments. Carmen Sparks identified the "Thinking about Teaching" task as the most important one of the Project for her. Carmen's development of a strategy for separating her written notes containing observations of Annie's teaching behaviors from her judgments about those behaviors gives support to her perception of the importance of that task.

For Donna Matthews, the evidence indicates that she understood the distinctions being suggested in the discussion of the task; but, because she inferred that giving judgment is bad and to be avoided, she had a great deal of frustration when she attempted to act on her newfound perception. Janet Harmon also ran into difficulty. She appeared to have understood the distinctions implied in the discussion of the task and was able to apply them effectively in thinking about her interactions with members of her family and with her colleagues, but she ran into difficulty when she attempted to apply them with her student teacher. Joan Brinkley indicated that she had already been through similar tasks designed to stimulate awareness of distinctions between the terms when she supervised other teachers in her role as department chair.
Attempting Indirect Supervision. Of the four teachers serving as informants in this study, only Carmen appears to have successfully moved from direct to indirect supervision of her student teacher. She was able to combine open-ended questions with leading questions early in the term, and then let the leading questions gradually fall away so that Annie was able to internalize open-ended questions that will help her think about her teaching in the future.

Donna Matthews initially tried to supervise with only open-ended questions and then became frustrated when her student teacher did not respond quickly with insights into what she needed to do to improve her classroom performance. Donna's frustration resulted in her conclusion that the leaders of the Project were wrong in what she inferred was their approach to supervising student teachers. She had a student who, in her judgment needed to be told what she was doing well and what she should change.

Janet Harmon's student teacher demanded a great deal of direct feedback from her, and so she never had an opportunity to apply indirect feedback strategies this year. Joan Brinkley indicated that she gave written feedback early in the term, but that the written response fell away in favor of "constant" oral communication for the remainder of Betty's time with her. Some evidence exists, however, that
Despite their spending entire days together, Betty may have continued to feel uncertain about where she stood with Joan. Perhaps Betty has an unusually high need for external validation, or perhaps it is true that they did not focus enough of their talk on Betty's teaching.

Implications

Of the Tasks and Discussions. The "Thinking about Teaching" task was, indeed, an important one for three of the four informants. That task appears to have acted as a catalyst for moving Carmen, Donna, and Janet toward attempting indirect supervision strategies. From the above evidence, especially the case of Carmen Sparks, it would appear that the best way to help someone learn to teach is to give very direct feedback at first and then to move gradually toward indirect strategies. Given the context of the clinical setting, that may well be the best approach.

This finding appears to be in conflict, however, with widely accepted beliefs that people learn best when totally immersed in doing a task rather than by being given isolated, discrete bits of the experience which must be assimilated by the learner. In considering how people best learn to teach, the context cannot be ignored. It is important here to remember also the concern of Davidman
(1985), who notes the incongruence between the reality of the clinical setting and the clinical supervision model (Cogan, 1973, and Goldhammer, 1969). Davidman points out that the relationship between the cooperating teacher or the supervisor and the student teacher are not nor can they ever be truly collegial. Cooperating teachers and supervisors do evaluate student teachers. And, none of the actors in the triad "owns" the experience.

In addition to these factors cited by Davidman, the length of the student teaching term and the nature of the environment come into play. Student teachers are typically placed in a school for ten to twelve weeks. They come into a hectic world where the interactions are often fragmented and given to interruption, as noted above. When they first begin teaching, they have a high need for guidelines; they need to know the "rules of the game." Thus, they seek specific feedback on their performance.

Cooperating teachers must remain concerned about the continued progress of their own students in the classroom. They must also find ways to foster an appropriate level of self-confidence in the student teacher while he or she learns rapidly to do complex teaching and classroom management behaviors. Thus, because of the nature of the work and its context, both cooperating teachers and their
student teachers tend to believe that direct, specific feedback early in the student teaching term is crucial.

The ten-week time frame, however, puts pressure on both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher to move quickly toward the mode of "reflective practitioner" (Schon, 1983). If the student teacher leaves the clinical experience without having internalized open-ended questions like the ones Carmen passed on to Annie, it is less likely that the beginner will develop those self-critical probes on his or her own later.

In addition to its important role in stimulating the thinking of these Project participants, the "Thinking about Teaching" task was important to the research study as well. More than any other Project experience, the informants' responses to that task illustrated how participation in the first year of the Project was a very different experience for each of these four teachers.

For Joan Brinkley, the Project was an opportunity to review concepts and approaches she believes she had mastered as a result of earlier inservice sessions on supervision. For Janet Harmon, the Project crystallized a problem she was to have with her student teacher regardless of whether she was a participant in the Project. Janet was unable to move from direct feedback because her student teacher required
that she tell him every next step so that he might "survive." The "Thinking about Teaching" task appears to have set Donna Matthews up for a high level of frustration with what she perceived to be the expectations Project leaders had for her. Only Carmen Sparks appears to have developed a way to separate more "objective" comments on what she sees from her value judgments on those observations in her written and oral response to her student teacher. Thus, she was able to provide an effective scaffold for her beginner's development. The amount of cooperating teacher/student teacher talk taped by Carmen was limited, however. A follow-up might help to determine the extent to which the building of such a scaffold appears in Carmen's dialogue with her next student teacher when she has less opportunity to interact with colleagues in the Project about her ongoing role as a cooperating teacher.

As noted earlier, many cooperating teachers lack the language in which to talk with their student teachers in ways that might be helpful in developing their teaching and/or their ability to think about their teaching (Griffin, 1983; O'Neal, 1983). In this limited sample, Carmen Sparks was able to develop the language she needed. Donna Matthews became frustrated when she attempted the new language without accompanying that new language with older, more
familiar language.

Janet Harmon was challenged with a student teacher who was unprepared to be moved toward critical reflection. Finally, Joan Brinkley offers yet another difference in response. Joan perceived that the Project Steering Committee intended for her to use indirect strategies. Since she believed that she was already doing so, she felt the "Thinking about Teaching" task only reinforced her work with student teachers.

For Further Research. In addition to further research to determine the extent to which Carmen uses a similar scaffolding approach with her next student teacher, a follow-up study with Donna Matthews is indicated to determine whether she will be able to develop an effective strategy for moving from direct to indirect supervision now that she has come to a clearer understanding that she was not being encouraged to abandon all direct feedback. An attempt to assess whether other participants in the Project made a similar inference that the Project leaders were suggesting that they avoid giving judgments to student teachers and, consequently, experienced frustrations similar to Donna's is also indicated.

Information might be collected and analyzed to determine the extent to which Janet Harmon is able to apply
her understanding of distinctions between observations and judgments with a student teacher who does not have the limitations that Greg had. And, an attempt could be made to determine whether other Project members were assigned student teachers who demonstrated limited growth across time and whether their experiences paralleled Janet's.

For Inservice in Clinical Supervision. These four case study reports have additional implications for anyone attempting to adopt or adapt from this model for an interactive, collaborative attempt at inservice education. Leaders of any such project should monitor the participants so as to avoid a repetition of Donna's frustrating experience. The inservice leaders should not, however, simply tell the participants to use specific, direct feedback early in the term. They should provide participants with an opportunity to come to a perception of the value of separating observations from judgments (e.g. the "Thinking about Teaching" task). They should also monitor the participants' understandings of the value of direct written feedback at the beginning of the student teaching term and the relationship of that feedback to both the beginners' moving toward critical reflection and the developmental nature of the student teaching experience.
It is also important to note that sometimes a cooperating teacher and a student teacher fall into a pattern of spending a great deal of time together and talking throughout the day as they move from period to period -- without ever having a specific time to talk about the beginner's teaching. Although it is not conclusive, there is some evidence that Betty may not have had a sense of how she was doing despite Joan's perspective that their communication was "constant."

Becoming a Teacher Educator

Evidence has been presented suggesting that all four of the informants in this study maintained a fairly high level of awareness of their role as Project member and that three of the four moved to a higher level of awareness of themselves as teacher educators.

Discussion

The Role in the Project

Each of the case study subjects made frequent direct or indirect references to her work in the Project; and each, in her own way, moved to a meta-perspective on her work as a cooperating teacher. Carmen Sparks attested to herself as
having become more accountable as a teacher and to her having been saved from going on "autopilot." Donna Matthews noted that this year she had spent a great deal more time thinking about her work with her student teacher. Largely because she had a student teacher who reached choice closure on teaching very early in the term, for Janet Harmon, the meta-focus was the nagging question, "Am I good at being a cooperating teacher or not?" For Joan Brinkley, the meta-perspective appears to have been of herself as a contributor to the growth of her colleagues as cooperating teachers.

To some extent, all four of the case study informants indicated their awareness of a need for time to talk with colleagues. Both Carmen Sparks and Joan Brinkley shared their delight in having had professional interaction in the Project sessions that took them to levels beyond those of social and/or faculty lounge talk (McPherson, 1972). Carmen Sparks and Janet Harmon identified the sessions as having been energy-producing time for each of them.

**Self-Efficacy as a Teacher Educator**

Three of the four research subjects raised concerns about university policies and/or approaches to preservice teacher education. Carmen Sparks told her foreign language colleagues of how her perspective on teaching Spanish
differs from that of the university professors. She also recommended that the people from the university consider a teacher exchange program with public school Spanish teachers. In so doing, Carmen called for the kind of collaboration between institutions of higher education and the public schools that is suggested by Evertson (1984) as noted in Chapter Two.

Donna Matthews voiced questions about the university programs in mathematics education, and Joan Brinkley cited several areas of concern, ranging from logistics to methods course expectations. Joan's most urgent complaint with the university program was that the English education faculty and student teaching supervisor place too many demands on the student teacher with reference to the amount of written work required of them. She also stressed the need for improved communication between the institutions, a clarification of roles among those working with student teachers, and a revision of the student teaching final evaluation form used by the university.

Two of the four informants were able to perceive changes in themselves that they linked directly to having participated in the Project. Carmen Sparks believed that she had become better at talking with her student teacher; Donna Matthews believed that she had become better at
listening to her student teacher. For Janet Harmon, it was significant that her perspective on herself as a teacher educator remained intact. She had had positive experiences with student teachers in the past. Despite her frustrations with Greg, she was able to recognize that his failures were not her fault.

**Implications**

**Awareness of Role.**

All four teachers became increasingly aware of themselves as project members and increasingly aware that others knew they were involved in the project. As the number of interactions requiring them to be in the role of teacher educator increased, their "commitment" to that role reached a higher level (Stryker, 1981). Thus, their role as a teacher educator moved to a higher position in their hierarchy of self-identified roles. These teachers came to own the role of teacher educator in ways that they had not done so before. Indicators of that ownership included their willingness to critique the college and university teacher education programs. With their newfound authority, they did not hesitate to recommend changes in those programs.
The two who were the most outspoken are, perhaps, the two who have reached the highest level of self-efficacy as teacher educators and/or those two for whom that role is located highest in their hierarchy of roles. Of the four, Joan Brinkley offered the most advice to representatives from the university. Janet Harmon offered none. Perhaps because Joan Brinkley had already been serving on the Teacher Education Committee at Allegheny State, her commitment to the role of teacher educator had already increased significantly. Involvement in the Clinical Faculty Project, then, served to boost that level of self-efficacy higher. Evidence has been presented that indicates that Carmen Sparks experienced a similar boost in self-efficacy.

Because of their frustrations in working with Kelly and Greg, Donna Matthews and Janet Harmon, respectively, experienced much less increase in self-efficacy. It is clear, however, that their levels of commitment to the role of teacher educator were affected positively.

Moving to a Broader Perspective.

As these teachers talked with each other and with representatives from higher education, they moved to a meta-perspective on their work as teachers, on their work as
teacher educators, and on their roles as members in the Project. By engaging in critical self-evaluation throughout the year, some of them may also have increased their levels of cognitive development (Theis-Sprinthall and Sprinthall, 1987).

As noted above, classroom teachers tend to be focused on the present, on the here-and-now (Jackson, 1968; O'Neal, 1983), and cooperating teachers tend to talk about situation-specific strategies with their student teachers rather than discussing options appropriate to the immediate concern and similar situations (Griffin, 1983). In this interactive, collaborative project in inservice education, some participants appear to have moved to broader perspectives on their work, to perspectives that allow for consideration of appropriate options for various contexts and contingencies.

Such shifts in perspective have not been the sole province of the Clinical Faculty members, however. The interactive inservice model also afforded representatives from higher education an opportunity to ground themselves once again in the realities of teaching. Top-down models of inservice training rarely offer opportunities for this important two-way exchange. In the discussion sessions, the college and university faculty members and graduate
assistants heard repeated reminders of the nature of teachers' work and of the context of the public school classroom. They were reminded of the crush of paper work, of the many interruptions and schedule changes, of the frequent need to make decisions simultaneously, and of the impact of society on the schools.

Supervision as a Developmental Process.

Just as learning how to teach is a developmental process, learning how to learn about student teaching supervision may be as well. For both student teachers and cooperating teachers, the process appears to be recursive rather than a lock-step progression of stages to be passed through. The four teachers whose stories appear in these cases are in very different places in their development as cooperating teachers. For example, Joan Brinkley appears to be both ahead of and behind the others in the process. Whereas she has high self-efficacy as a teacher educator, she appears to be less able than the others to engage in critical reflection on her own teaching. On the other hand, she indicated that she had previously been sensitized to the perspectives of student teachers by thinking about her own student teaching experience, and she had distinguished between observations and judgments as part of her earlier
work as a department head.

The Project participants included a wide array of cooperating teachers from different subject areas and grade levels and with varied professional and personal backgrounds. They, no doubt, had a variety of responses to the Project tasks and discussion topics as well as varied experiences with their student teachers. Although the four cases are too small a sample for generalizing, it is likely that these four teachers had some responses that were similar to those of other colleagues in the Project. Thus, the stories of these four teachers' first year in the Project offer a window on the experience of the others. The variety of responses to Project tasks and discussions and the differing approaches to their work used by the cooperating teachers suggest that there may be many appropriate ways to work effectively with student teachers.

Building on What Was Learned.

If it is, indeed, true that we learn best those concepts we attempt to teach to others, then perhaps the next phase of this Project should be to find ways for these Clinical Faculty members to work with other cooperating teachers. Their efforts, however, should not be a top-down attempt to transfer to their colleagues in their schools the
insights they have gained, but rather an interactive, collaborative engaging of them in a dialogue about the student teaching experience, a dialogue similar to the one they have engaged in with representatives from higher education and with each other.

If their intentions are to extend the dialogue beyond their own school divisions, they might collaborate in the writing of a casebook for cooperating teachers similar to the one done by Shulman and Colbert (1987) of the Far West Laboratories in San Francisco. The Mentor Teacher Casebook presents vignettes about experiences typically encountered by first-year teachers. The vignettes were written by mentor teachers and are accompanied by interpretive commentary. Rather than telling the mentor teacher what to do to help the beginner, they serve as stimulus to discussion among mentors who are attempting to improve their mentoring skills. Or, the Clinical Faculty members may want to develop their own model creating a document that will raise the appropriate questions and stimulate cooperating teachers to talk about the student teaching experience in ways that will afford them new insights to their roles as facilitators to the development of the beginner. In any event, it will probably not be very helpful if they revert to a direct approach to training
their colleagues in clinical supervision.

Conclusion

The collaborative design of the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project offered Carmen, Donna, Janet, Joan, and the other participants an opportunity for extended talk about and new perspectives on the student teaching experience. It also fostered their sense of ownership over what they were learning about that experience in partnership with representatives from higher education.

As the Clinical Faculty members and the representatives from Allegheny State and Highlands made meaning together, they were instrumental in taking local action partially to close the communication gap that has long existed between higher education and the public schools everywhere. They opened a two-way communication that offered the possibility of an exchange of teaching ideas and strategies between public school classrooms and campus methods courses.

As Project leaders and Clinical Faculty members worked together in the first year of the Project, they developed an interactive, collaborative model of inservice education, a model that allowed them to learn together about working with student teachers. It is, perhaps, a model that could be
adapted to other settings and/or to other topics as an alternative to those top-down models of inservice training that, as a classroom teacher, I once found to be neither endearing nor enduring, those models of inservice education that have done so little to bring about meaningful educational change.
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## Structure of Sessions/Time Line of First Year Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10/26</th>
<th>10/28</th>
<th>11/2</th>
<th>11/16</th>
<th>12/9</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- **January-April:** Sessions were held in the schools. Participants met in subject area groups (large-teacher, small-group) and with the University College and Virginia Tech faculty members who are the Project Steering Committee members.
- **May:** All CF participants met again at the University of Virginia for one week to discuss future directions.
DESCRIPTION OF PHASE I TASKS
PHASE I TASKS

A description of each of the tasks Clinical Faculty members were asked to do during Phase I of the Project and the purposes of those tasks are listed below. The dates of the tasks are included with each.

10/26 CONCEPT-BUILDING TASK

Participants first brainstormed a list in response to the following question. They then selected the 5 items they deemed most important. They were asked to share 3 of the 5 leaving out duplications. Then they indicated their top 3 items from the group list. Participants were also asked to comment on anything they found interesting and/or surprising in the discussion.

The Question: When you think of teachers who work with student teachers, what words and/or phrases might you use to describe a teacher who works successfully with a student teacher?

Purposes:

1. To stimulate thinking of participants about the qualities they see as important to working successfully with a student teacher.

2. To involve everyone in making a contribution to the group.

3. To establish feelings of group membership quickly; to begin to develop feelings of trust in the groups.

4. To collect baseline data on how Clinical Faculty members see the role of the co-operating teacher at the beginning of the project.

5. To collect impressions of how Clinical Faculty members felt about the initial task.
I. CONCERNS TASK

Participants were asked to generate a list of concerns (not necessarily negative items) of the experienced teacher and a list of concerns of the student teacher and to rank the categories in order of importance to each.

Purposes:

1. To provide opportunity to talk about major issues of problems related to one's own teaching. (Enables them to share their conception of teaching.)

2. To provide opportunity to project what the major problems or concerns of a student teacher might be.

3. To contrast the life of the experienced teacher with that of the student teacher.

II. CLASSROOM AWARENESS TASK

Participants were asked to read Case 1 (lesson in a high school literature classroom), to describe what they "saw," to reread, and to describe again.

Purpose:

1. To increase awareness of the complexities of classroom life.

2. To recognize the value of focusing observation because there is so much to see.

III. THINKING ABOUT TEACHING TASK

Participants were asked to read Case 2 (lesson in an elementary classroom), write a description of what they "saw." Then they were asked to record their observations and judgments made. The discussion involved defining the terms observation and judgment and then reconsidering how they had labeled each of their phrases (as "observation" or "judgment").

Finally, participants completed an "Observations and Judgments Test" and discussed the answers for further clarification of the two labels.
Purposes:
1. To examine out language as a reflection about teaching.

2. To differentiate between observations and judgments in our talk about teaching.

3. To link observations and judgments as we share our reasoning about a teaching event.

10/28 to 11/2 FOLLOW-UP TO ANALYSIS TASK # 1

On October 28, participants were asked to select and describe 2 students as subjects of brief case studies -- 1 with whom they enjoyed working and 1 with whom they did not enjoy working or about whom they have ambivalent feelings. They were then to observe the 2 learners over 3 days making notes on their observations.

Purposes:
1. To give the opportunity for some focused looking in the classroom.

2. To give the opportunity to discuss the implications of that looking as it may be related to the analysis of teaching.

11/2 to 12/7 FOLLOW-UP TO ANALYSIS TASK # 2

On November 2, participants were asked to audiotape or to videotape a lesson, write a reaction to the lesson, listen to (view) the lesson, write a second reaction, select an issue to study, develop a looking strategy and examine the issue closely, prepare a summary of the analysis to present to the group on November 16 (or December 7).

Purpose:
To examine the nature of a systematic, reflective process by applying principles of analysis of teaching to one's own practice.
INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH

Overview

Consent Forms
OVERVIEW

FOCUS:

I will attempt to describe the Clinical Faculty Project from the perspectives of the Project participants related to one secondary school.

PURPOSES:

1) Formative evaluation of the CF Project -- so that we might better direct the ongoing Project activities.

2) Summative evaluation of the CF Project -- so that we might give an account of the Project implementation and outcomes to the funding agency, the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia.

3) Research on the Allegheny State/Highlands College model for the improvement of the student teaching experience -- so that we may add to the knowledge base on collaboration between institutions of higher education and the public schools.

DATA COLLECTION:

Informants -- CF members who teach at selected school, building principal of selected school, CF steering committee members, CF advisory committee members, selected student teachers.

Interview Schedules
-- With CF Members:

Week 1  Prof. Bio.; Views of teaching, ST
Week 3  St.T's induction to the field, CF Proj.
Week 8  CF/ST communication, CF Proj.--PhaseI
Week 14  CF/ST communication, CF Proj., other?

--With Principal, CFSC Members, CSAC Members:

Week 5  Perspectives on Implementation
Week 17  Perspectives on Outcomes
Observation Schedules

The researcher will conduct one classroom observation of each of the 7 teachers. (Week 3)

The researcher will attend as many CF sessions involving the selected CF members as possible given the constraint that some sessions meet concurrently. (Week 1 - Week 16)

The researcher will ask the CF member to tape conferences between the CF member and his/her student teacher. (Week 5 - Week 13)

OTHER?
INFORMED CONSENT FORM -- CF MEMBER

I consent to participate in the study of the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project being conducted by Lynne Alvine (Graduate Student, College of Education, Allegheny State and Instructor in Education, Highlands College.)

I understand that I will be interviewed on my role in the Clinical Faculty Project. I understand that I may be asked questions about my perspectives on selection of Project participants, intentions of the Project, and large and small group sessions conducted with Project participants. I understand that I may also be asked about my work with/as a student teacher in the Spring Semester, 1989.

I understand that my responses will be analyzed for the purpose of describing the Clinical Faculty Project as it relates to one secondary school. I understand that my responses, along with those of others, will be used in the preparation of an evaluative report on the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project for the State Council of Higher Education, for a doctoral dissertation written by Lynne Alvine, and possibly in the preparation of presentations and/or articles to follow.

Further, I understand that: 1) pseudonyms will be used for me and my school in the report and any subsequent materials published from the project; 2) I may ask questions regarding the study at any time; 3) I may review all parts of the report and any further materials prepared for dissemination; and 4) I may choose to leave the study at any time.

I agree to participate in interviews with the researcher and to have the researcher conduct observations of my work with/as a student teacher.

Print Name: __________________ Date: ________________
(Informant)

Signature: ____________________ ____________________
(Researcher)

I give my consent as building principal for the interviews and observations described above to be conducted in my school.
Date: ________________
(Building Principal)
INFORMED CONSENT FORM -- ST

I consent to participate in the study of the Allegheny State / Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project being conducted by Lynne Alvine (Graduate Student, College of Education, Allegheny State and Instructor in Education, Highlands College.)

I understand that I may be interviewed on my role as a student teacher working with a Clinical Faculty member in the Spring Semester, 1989. I understand that some of my talk with my co-operating teacher may be tape recorded for analysis by the researcher. I understand that my co-operating teacher will engage in a series of interviews about his/her work with me this semester and that in those interviews will be sharing perceptions about my progress as a student teacher with the researcher.

I understand that my responses and those of my co-operating teacher will be analyzed for the purpose of describing the Clinical Faculty Project as it relates to one secondary school. I understand that my responses, along with those of others, will be used in the preparation of an evaluative report on the Allegheny State / Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project for the State Council of Higher Education, for a doctoral dissertation written by Lynne Alvine, and possibly in the preparation of presentations and/or articles to follow.

Further, I understand that: 1) pseudonyms will be used for me and my school in the report and any subsequent materials published from the project; 2) I may ask questions regarding the study at any time; 3) I may review all parts of the report and any further materials prepared for dissemination; and 4) I may choose to leave the study at any time without any effect on my student teaching grade by simply indicating my withdrawal to Dr. Patricia Kelly, English Education at Allegheny State.

I agree to participate in interviews with the researcher and to have the researcher conduct observations of my work with/as a student teacher.

Print Name: ________________ Date: ____________
(Informant)

Signature: ________________ (Researcher)

I give my consent as building principal for the interviews and observations described above to be conducted in my school.

Date: ____________
(Building Principal)
INTERVIEW GUIDELINES
INTERVIEW GUIDELINES -- INTERVIEW #1

EXPLAIN ABOUT THE INTERVIEW: I'm interested in learning about teaching and working with student teachers and being in the Clinical Faculty Project from your perspective as a Clinical Faculty member who teaches at this high school. In later interviews I'll be asking about your perspectives on the Project and on your work with a student teacher this semester. Today I want to learn about your background and professional experiences. I want to understand your views of teaching and learning. I also want to understand your perspectives on working with student teachers from Allegheny State and/or Highlands College based on your previous experiences. I want to understand your views of these things through your eyes . . . to hear you talk about them in the language you would use with your colleagues. . . . This won't be the kind of interview where I will fire one question after another at you. It will be more like a conversation. I'll want to get you to talking, to telling stories, to expressing whatever comes to mind as we talk. In fact, I'll try to keep my interruptions of your thoughts to a minimum. OK?

Descriptive Questions:

1) Tell me about yourself as a teacher. Tell me about the experiences that led you to teaching _____ at this school.

Tell me about your preparation to teach.

Tell me about your teaching experience -- where? what subjects?

Tell me about your previous work with student teachers. How many have you worked with? From what schools?

Tell me about why you think you were selected to participate in the CF Project. What qualities do you have as a person, as a professional that helped you to be selected?

2) Now, I'd like to hear your views of teaching and learning. Tell me about your classroom environment. What is your classroom like?
Recently, you probably had a time when you felt really good about your teaching -- a particular day or a certain class? What was it about your role as a teacher that created that good feeling?

Tell me about your strengths as a teacher. What else?

Tell me about any concerns you have about your work as a teacher.

3] Now, I'd like to hear your views of the student teaching experience.

How many student teachers have you had from Allegheny State? from Highlands?

Tell me about your involvement with student teachers from Allegheny State in the past.

--with student teachers from Highlands College.

Tell me about your sense of those student teachers' major strengths? (Allegheny State? Highlands?)

What would you have liked for them to do better by the end of their student teaching?

Tell me about other concerns you have had in the past in your work with student teachers.

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES:

Descriptive Questions: Tell me about ____________________.

Structured Questions: Are there different kinds of _____? Is _____ included in _______?

Are _____, _____, and _____ the same kind of thing?

Contrast Questions: How is _____ different from _____? Which are more alike than the other? _____, _____, & ____?
INTERVIEW GUIDELINES -- INTERVIEW # 2

Last time we focused on 3 areas: your professional background, your views of teaching and learning, and your views of the student teaching experience. Today I want to turn to the topic of induction of a student teacher into the field. I want to come to know what those first few days of working with a student teacher are like from your perspective, through your eyes. I want to hear you talk about those first few days in your own language, in the language you might use with a colleague. In the past few weeks, you have gone through the induction process with your current student teacher. First, I'll want you to talk about what you've done recently with this student teacher, but I'll also want you to describe previous experiences with induction of student teachers. OK?

Descriptive Questions:

1) Tell me about the past few weeks with your current student teacher.

When and how did he/she first make contact? first come the school?

What did you do first on the day he/she arrived?

Tell me about other things you did that day to orient him/her to the school, to the classroom.

Tell me about what you did initially to help the student teacher plan for lessons.

Tell me about anything else you have done with your current student teacher.

Tell me about your structures for communication with this student teacher. Time frames? Written dialogue?
2) Tell me about the first few days with previous student teachers.

How did they first make contact? first come to the school?

What did you do first on the day they arrived?

Tell me about other things you did that first day to orient them to the school, to the classroom.

Tell me about what you used to do to help your student teachers plan for lessons.

What else did you do early on to facilitate the induction to student teaching?

What were the structures for communication with previous student teachers? Time frames? Written dialogue?

3) Tell me about ways your participation in the Clinical Faculty Project has changed the way you work with the induction of a student teacher.

How has the talk in the Project changed your thinking about this aspect of the student teaching experience?

Were there specific strategies you picked up from others in the Project?

Is there anything else you want to say about your participation in the project?
INTERVIEW GUIDELINES -- INTERVIEW # 3

Explain about the interview: In the 1st interview we talked about your views of teaching and learning. In the 2nd, we talked about how you introduced your student teacher to the school and classroom community. Today I want to take you back to some of the tasks we have had you do in the Clinical Faculty Project. I'm interested in knowing your perspectives on certain of the tasks and anything they may have caused you to think about or do in the interim since you worked with those tasks.

Again, I'm interested in your perspectives, so I'll urge you to say as much as you can in response to the prompts I give. At our 1st session on October 26, we brainstormed a list of qualities a person would have who worked effectively with student teachers. Then in the all-day session on October 28, we did 3 tasks. In the morning we looked at the concerns of an experienced teacher and the concerns we thought a student teacher would have and how those 2 lists might be different. Then we read a case and described what was happening twice to make the point that there is so much to see in a classroom, that the classroom is a complex environment. After lunch that Friday, we did a task that asked us to consider the difference between observations and judgments. It is this task that I first want you to talk about.

11 We read a case about an elementary classroom lesson on Columbus. You were asked to write a description of what you "saw." Then you were asked to record your observations and judgments on a sheet. The discussion in the small groups involved defining those two terms and reconsidering how you had labeled each of your phrases. Finally, you completed an "Observations and Judgments Test" and discussed your answers for further clarification of the two terms.

Can you identify any connections you may have made between doing that task and working with a student teacher?

Have those terms ever come up in your talk with your student teacher or in your thoughts about working with him or her? Tell me about any such connections or thoughts.
2) On October 28 before you left Highlands, we asked you to select and describe 2 students as subjects of brief case studies -- one with whom you enjoyed working and one with whom you did not enjoy working or about whom you had ambivalent feelings. You were asked to observe the 2 learners over 3 days making notes on your observations. I'd like you to think of those 2 students once again.

First, tell me about the student you liked.

Now, would you describe the other student?

How has your sense of the 2 students changed since October?

3) On November 2 before you left Highlands, we asked you to audiotape or to videotape a lesson, write a reaction to the lesson, listen to (view) the lesson, write a second reaction, select an issue to study, develop a strategy and examine the issue closely, and to prepare a summary of the analysis to present to the group at the next session.

Tell me about what you learned from doing this task. What were your insights, gains, and/or outcomes from the task?

Tell me about how what you learned from the that task may have affected your teaching since then?

Tell me about how what you learned from that task may have affected your work with a student teacher since then.

4) Since our last large group meeting at Highlands on December 7, you have met with the other (VTE) (secondary teachers and your subject area) colleagues in the Project. You have had several discussions that related to working with student teachers in addition to their induction and/or orientation which we have already talked about.

Tell me about any other connections you have been making between those discussions and your ongoing work with your student teacher. Are there other connections?
INTERVIEW GUIDELINES -- INTERVIEW # 4

Explain about the Interview: In our talk today, I will ask your sense of any changes in your own teaching this year, about various ways you have communicated your thoughts to your student teacher, and about your sense of his or her readiness to teach. Just as in previous interviews, I want you to use your own words, to go ahead and say whatever comes to mind in response to the prompts that I give. OK?

Descriptive Questions:

1] Tell me about any changes you have seen in your own teaching this year.

   Have there been changes in your approach to presenting material?
   In your questioning?
   In your pacing of instruction?
   In your management of your classes?
   In your evaluation of student progress?
   In any other areas?

2] Now I'd like for you to tell me about your communication with your student teacher this year. We've talked about differentiating between observations and judgments in some of our work together. And we've agreed that judgments are not necessarily bad. Some of the CF members have noted that student teachers want the judgement of their co-operating teachers.

   Can you list for me all of the ways that you have communicated to your student teacher your judgement of his or her teaching performance.

   Would you describe the variety of ways your student teacher reacted to those judgments?

   Some of those reactions you've described probably led to an uncomfortable situation. What factors made the uncomfortable situations different from the more comfortable sessions.
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Have your ways of communicating your judgments to this student teacher been different from the ways you've given feedback in the past?

3) We've been talking about your giving ongoing evaluative feedback to your student teacher as part of your role as facilitator to the student teacher's growth. Now, I'd like to turn to the other aspect of evaluation -- summative evaluation of the student teacher's performance -- the final judgement.

What would you have liked this student teacher to be able to do better before he/she finished?

What do you believe your role should be in the determination of the student teacher's final grade?

4) Tell me about any interaction you have had with cooperating teachers who are not in the Clinical Faculty Project.

5) Finally, would you describe for me how you managed the task of recording samples of your conferences with your student teacher?

How often did you record?
   For how long?
   Did you take the beginning of the talk? Middle? End?
   Was there any prior planning of your focus in the recorded talk that was different from your other conferences?
   Have you listened to any of the tapes?

Is there anything else you would like to say at this time about your involvement in the Allegheny State/Highlands College Clinical Faculty Project?

312
FINAL SESSION RESPONSES
FINAL SESSION RESPONSES

Characteristics of a Successful CF

The following combined list represents all responses to the question:

What words or phrases would you use to describe a Clinical Faculty member who works successfully with student teachers?

Because the participants in the various groups used various labels to represent what might be presumed to be similar characteristics, the compilation of these data required considerable interpretation. The list does give some indication of the way the large group sees the concept of effective Clinical Faculty member.

(31) Good role model
(17) Enjoys teaching; is enthusiastic about subject matter
(13) Caring; Empathetic
(12) Willing to spend needed time; wants a student teacher
(10) Flexible
(10) Organized
(8) Good communication skills
(6) Patient
(4) Is able to critique, give feedback in a helpful way
(4) Shares ideas, materials, information with student teacher
(2) Professional
(2) Encouraging
(2) Is a growing educator
(1) Open-minded
  Confident in own skills
  Able to be honest and tactful
  Dedicated
  Creative
Guides the student teacher to become focused in self-analysis
FINAL SESSION RESPONSES

Summary of Responses to Questions 2 and 3:

2) What did you find most interesting in your work with the Project this year?

3) What did you find most surprising in your work in the Project this year?

(These responses are summarized together because so many of the items overlapped. What some participants deemed interesting, others found to be surprising and vice versa. Separating the two questions elicited a fuller response than considering them together might have. Summarizing them together is the best way to see what aspects of their work in the project have remained salient for the participants.)

* (39) Gains from the sessions.

(25) Specific techniques, content, strategies, etc. presented or developed in the Project.

(14) Specific ideas suggested by CF colleagues.

* (34) That interests and concerns about teaching and working with student teachers are common across grade levels and subject areas.

* (26) Increased awareness.

(16) Self-awareness; awareness of role as a Clinical Faculty member.

(10) Self-validation; confidence in role as CF member.

* (10) Unexpected enjoyment in participation in the Project.

* (7) The stipend -- that the State would fund such a Project.

* (7) How much time, effort, interest, etc. were needed for involvement in the Project. (Some viewed this aspect positively, some negatively.)

* (5) How quickly members developed bonds to the group(s), trust, ease of communication.

* (3) Differences in views of, approaches to supervision of a student teacher.
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* (3) Better awareness of roles of college personnel (faculty, supervisors).

* (3) That student teachers were interested in the Project.
FINAL SESSION RESPONSES

Summary of Responses to Question 4:

What are your needs for next year as a Clinical Faculty member in the Project?

* (22) Develop clear, written guidelines for all involved in the student teaching experience.
(10) Write a handbook for Clinical Faculty and other co-operating teachers to use as a reference.
(10) Develop checklists, time lines for phasing in, calendars, expectations, etc. for use by CF and other co-operating teachers.
(2) Create a format for a handbook that CF from each school could develop to give to their student teachers.

* (16) Continue discussion of evaluation criteria and process for determining final grade; revise evaluation forms.

* (13) Suggestions about CF groupings for next year's sessions.
(6) Continue heterogenous groups (4 request the same group.)
(4) Continue subject area and/or grade level groups.
(2) Middle school people should meet as a separate group sometimes.

* (11) Earlier and more contact with the prospective student teacher prior to the student teaching term.
(8) Student teacher and CF should meet earlier, perhaps socially or on a work day.
(3) More time should be given to prior planning of units of instruction, etc.
(2) Need for more time to observe (all day) and expectations for their time in the school should be more clear.

* (9) Need for attention to communication and consistency problems.
(7) Better communication between University supervisors and CFs so there is more consistency.
(1) Tell student teachers more about the CF Project.
(1) Focus more on how to communicate with a student teacher.
* (7) Clinical Faculty members need more quality time with their student teachers each day.

* (7) Clinical Faculty members were pleased with the discussions this year and want next year to be a continuation of more of the same topics and issues.
(2) Have another all-day session.

* (5) Desire to be better informed about and/or involved in on-campus preservice methods classes.

* (5) Focus on specific observation techniques, guidelines, etc., including the use of video tapes of student teachers.

* (5) Information about BTAP competencies.

* (5) Include all teachers who have student teachers; add new CF members.

* (4) Include student teachers in CF discussions.
(1) Include University Supervisors in CF meetings.

* (4) Resolve logistics problems in registering for a course at Allegheny State.

* (4) Send better student teachers.

* (3) Set the dates, agenda for next year as soon as possible so conflicts can be avoided.

* (2) Include more self-evaluation activities.

* (2) Make goals, intentions, directions of the Project more clear.

* (1) Follow up on student teachers during the 1st year of teaching.

* (1) Chip in and have a refreshment committee feed us.

* (1) Have less repetition in the meetings.

* (1) Have fewer meetings (consolidate topics).
FINAL SESSION RESPONSES

Summary of Responses to Final Question:

How can we extend the effects of the Project beyond next year?

* (18) Need for dissemination of information about the Project.
  (8) To the General Assembly to encourage further funding.
  (3) To the general public through the mass media.
  (3) To local school boards to enlist their support.
  (3) To local colleagues, including fellow teachers, principals, and subject area supervisors.

* (15) Need for all Co-operating Teachers to have a similar experience either in the form of inservice workshops or a course.

* (13) Interest that this group of CF members continue working at Project-related tasks.
  (9) As "trainers" of new CF members.
  (4) As adjunct faculty involved in methods classes, etc.

* (12) Need to compile a guide or handbook for teachers who work with student teachers based on the understandings gained in the Project.

  (8) By voluntarily meeting regularly to discuss concerns related to working with a student teacher.
  (3) By continuing to receive information related to the supervision of student teachers.

* (8) Interest in receiving credit toward certificate renewal for work as a Clinical Faculty member.
* (5) Interest in special endorsement of teaching certificate as a Clinical Supervisor of student teachers.

* (4) Interest in finding a way for Tech/Hollins faculty to continue providing leadership for Project-related work.

* (2) Need for funds for released time to work with student teachers.

* (2) Interest in combining abilities of Clinical Faculty members to work with student teachers with a program to offer mentorship for first year teachers.
February 22, 1989

To: Carmen, Dorothy, Donna, Joan, Janet, Ron, Ted

From: Lynne Alvine

Re: Taping of Talk with Student Teacher

When we first talked about your collaborating with me in this study of the Project, I asked about the possibility of your helping me find ways to have a window on the interaction you have with your student teacher. One way we came up with was the idea of your taping some of the talk the two of you engage in.

I have been thinking about the best way to go about this taping, considering the fact that my apartment is already looking like a used cassette tape warehouse. It is not possible for you to tape everything you and your student teacher say to each other. Even if that were possible, I would never be able to listen to all of those tapes in this lifetime. So, I what I would like for you to do is to tape a sample of your talk each week.

By now you probably have an idea of which class will pose the greatest challenge to your student teacher. Select one such class. (If you change later, that's OK too. I just think it would be helpful to me for the two of you to be talking about the same class each time.) Would you, could you find a place away from other voices and/or strange unidentifiable noises to tape record your POST-OBSERVATION conference on that class once each week? (If the quality of the tape is not good, it is wasted effort on your part and mine.)

I suspect the amount of time you have for such conferences is quite variable. I'm giving you tape here for 15 minutes per week through the week of April 24. I know that time will seem short, but work with it to get the best quality of talk even if it means backing up and starting the recorder again when you really start to talk about what went on in the lesson. If you have a 30-minute conference one week that is really interesting, don't erase it! Don't tape the next week, or keep it shorter the next time. The main thing is that you realize that more is not necessarily better. A short snippet from the heart of a conference can be very interesting. Also, I think it's important for you
not to think too much about how I will be working with these tapes. This is the old "don't-tell-me-what-you-think-I-want-to-hear" speech.

I've labeled each of the 2 tapes for 15 minutes per week. PLEASE indicate the DATE and PERIOD of the lesson and the DATE and PERIOD, CONTEXT, etc. of the Post-observation Conference.

e.g. Under "Week of Feb. 27," you might write:
"Taught: English 10* OR "Taught: Earth Science
3rd period, 2/28/89 5th Period, 2/28/89
Same day." Next Day, 3/1/89."

No interviews for a couple of weeks!!

OH! If you are making written notes on observations or if you have a written dialogue with your ST, make sure you date each entry. Keep it in a notebook, a folder?? Hang onto it?

Office: T-TH PM 362-6432.
June 1, 1989

To: Carmen, Dorothy, Donna, Joan, Janet, Ron, and Ted
From: Lynne Alvine
Re: Listening to Taped Talk with Student Teacher

Thank You! Thank You! Thank You! Nearly all of the interviews have been transcribed and await my attention. They completely fill four 1" notebooks. You have provided me with a wealth of "reading material" for the summer (which started for me Tuesday). At some point this summer, I expect to be able to bring a copy of your four interviews to each of you so that you might read through and make any clarifying comments you feel are necessary in the margins. Of course you don't have to read the texts if you choose not to do so, but I think it might be interesting for you to see what you had to say. Later, of course, I will be sharing with you what I write about what you had to say.

During our last interview, I asked each of you if you would be willing to listen to the tape(s) of talk with your student teacher that you made at my request. And all of you agreed! Thanks again! I've been trying to think of how you might do this in the least time-consuming and most helpful way. Since there was quite a lot of variability in the ways you approached the task, I needed to find a flexible structure for your response.

Here's what I want you to do:

1) Please find a block of time (even if it means waiting until after school is out for the year) when you will be able to listen through all of the conversation that you taped and then do some thinking and writing about what you have heard.

2) Read the questions (¶4).

3) Listen to all of the tape(s).
41. Respond in writing to each of the following questions:
   a) In listening, what did you learn about working with a student teacher?
   b) In listening, what did you learn about yourself as a teacher educator?
   c) In each of the above, what, specifically, did you hear that helped you to learn what you did?

51. Phone me at Highlands 362-6432 and leave a message to the effect that you have finished, and I will get back to you about when and where I might get the tapes and your written response from you. . . OR, bring them with you when you come to the July 5 meeting.

That's all. Thanks again, for everything!
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