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(ABSTRACT)

This ethnographic study explores the nature of the conversations between two colleagues, a more experienced and a less experienced university professor, during the planning sessions, class meetings, and debriefings of a reading assessment course. The study describes what happened during the planning sessions and class debriefings of the more experienced professor, and how the conversations between the two colleagues assisted them in further developing their teaching.

Case study methods (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Merriam, 1988) were used to conduct and analyze the study. The data included field notes, course documents, and transcriptions of the audio taped planning sessions, class meetings, and debriefings.

The findings of this study strongly support
Vygotsky's notion that conversation is a major "tool" for mediating learning. The more experienced professor used conversations: 1) to create and refine tasks, 2) to assess the quality of tasks, 3) to reflect on student performance, 4) to critique his instruction, 5) to reflect on himself as a teacher, and 6) to systematically focus on his teaching. The less experienced professor used conversations: 1) to build confidence as a learner, 2) to develop a repertoire of ideas for teaching at the university level, 3) to acquire strategies for engaging students in the learning process, 4) to gain a better understanding of the capabilities of students preparing to teach, 5) to gain insight about the materials a university professor uses, and 6) to learn about some of the responsibilities and opportunities connected to university teaching.

The study suggests that a model of teacher education where more experienced teachers reveal their own work may be very helpful to the development of teaching.
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CHAPTER 1

Rationale

If as a researcher one is interested in how people build their understanding, then the way to gain better insight is to watch them do it, and try to make sense of it as it happens. (Armstrong, in Engel, 1984, paraphrased by Duckworth, 1987, p. 134).

This epigraph exemplifies one way a researcher may gain insight into how people build understandings; to watch them do it and try to make sense of it as it happens. I believe the idea conveyed in this epigraph can be strengthened considerably by adding the component of conversation. It is through conversation that one may develop, share, assist, and clarify his/her thinking and learning (Vygotsky, 1962, 1978, 1986, 1987; Wertsch, 1991; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Therefore, the component of conversation in conjunction with observation may help a researcher (or anyone interested in learning) develop a deeper sense of what happens during and within settings.

Questioning, self-talk, instructing, and providing feedback are some forms of conversation that have been researched as a means of assisting performance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). However, one of the most important considerations relative to the function of conversation in learning has to do with the notion that "meaningful discourse is the medium in which society creates minds,"
and by which minds create society. For literacy, meaningful discourse is both destination and vehicle" (Tharp and Gallimore, 1988, p. 93).

**Theoretical Framework**

Many ideas about the functions of conversation relative to learning are rooted in the psychological notions of Lev Vygotsky. Vygotsky (1987) stated that the initial function of speech is social interaction and communication, "a means of expression and understanding" (p. 48). Through speech one is able to intentionally share his/her experiences and thoughts, thus providing opportunities for learning and achieving one's potential. Vygotsky explained that experiences and thoughts are better understood when participants are able to generalize and name what they are experiencing. Relating such experiences to a specific class of experiences known to the partner who is participating in the interaction greatly assists understanding. Vygotsky elaborated that there are many examples which could be used to demonstrate the link between social interaction and generalization. To illustrate, he expressed that he could convey he was cold by using expressive movements such as shivering. However, for true understanding and communication to occur relative to those expressive movements, he said he must generalize and name what was being experienced. The shivering movements could indicate something other than being cold. He went on to say that without appropriate
concepts and generalizations, understandings often are impossible.

Vygotsky (1978) also noted several specific purposes of speech. He said speech accompanies practical activity; it is an aid to complex human activities; and it can play a specific role in carrying out activities. To illustrate how speech may be used by children in such activities, Vygotsky referred to an experiment conducted by his collaborator, R. E. Levina. In that experiment, a child was asked to obtain a piece of candy from a cupboard. The candy was placed out of the child's reach. As the child approached the task, Levina noted that the child began to describe and analyze the situation. As the child became more involved in the task, her speech took on a "planful" character that reflected several possible paths toward a solution. Finally, speech was included as part of the solution. For example:

A four-and-a-half-year-old girl was asked to get candy from a cupboard with a stool and a stick as possible tools. Levina's description reads as follows: (Stands on a stool, quietly looking, feeling along a shelf with stick.) "On the stool." (Glances at experimenter. Puts stick in other hand.) "Is that really the candy?" (Hesitates.) "I can get it from that other stool, stand and get it." (Gets second stool.) "No, that doesn't get it. I could use the stick." (Takes stick,
knocks at the candy.) "It will move now." (Knocks candy.) "It moved, I couldn't get it with the stool, but the, but the stick worked." (p. 25).

From this incident, Vygotsky highlighted that it seems both natural and necessary for children to talk while they act. In fact, Vygotsky's and Levina's research demonstrated two important facts about speech:

1. A child's speech is as important as the role of action in attaining the goal. Children not only speak about what they are doing; their speech and action are part of one and the same complex psychological function, directed toward the solution of the problem at hand.

2. The more complex the action demanded by the situation and the less direct its solution, the greater the importance played by speech in the operation as a whole. Sometimes speech becomes of such vital importance that, if not permitted to use it, young children cannot accomplish the given task. (pp. 25-26).

I believe these observations made by Vygotsky hold true for adults as well. A prime example of an adult going through a similar process is when s/he loses or misplaces car keys. Perhaps you have heard someone comment: "I came in and went to the kitchen, perhaps they are in there." (Looking about.) "No, I must of put them on the dresser in the bedroom. Now where would be the most logical place
for me to have put them? Perhaps they're in my coat pocket." (Shaking jacket). "I usually put my keys on this tray as I enter the house." (Thought - "entered the house"). "Perhaps they're in the door lock." (Checks the keyhole.) "There they are! Can you believe that!"

Other researchers have drawn similar conclusions as to the significance of speech in achieving actionable solutions to "practical" and "complex" problems. Speech can be used to organize purposeful behavior such as delving into the essence of things, and unraveling complex connections that are not accessible to direct perceptions (Luria, 1981). It can be used to sort ones thoughts and organize perception and action (Bruner, 1985). Additionally, Smith (1990) argued that we can get a good idea of our thought processes by observing the way we behave and talk.

**Purpose of the Study**

According to Vygotsky (1978), some things may be so difficult that the only way to reach understandings and solutions is to talk about them. He considered conversation to be a major tool for assisting humans in solving complex activities they may encounter. Teaching is a complex activity. Therefore, it may be important to examine the conversations in this study to see how conversation can help people, who are looking for ways to do so, improve teaching.
I believe one way to learn more about teaching is to engage in consistent conversations with teachers who are recognized as being outstanding in the field. Such teachers can be identified based on awards received, colleague recognition, student recognition, and so on. If we recognize that such teachers are successful, then we have to assume that they have made some good choices, and that the conclusions they have drawn are good. We base our assumptions on the fact that peers, colleagues, and students have consistently identified them as being excellent teachers.

Through conversation, teachers can share their knowledge and experiences which have come about through years of work. During their career, teachers have played around with ideas, sorted things out, studied, read extensively, reflected on their practice, made many decisions, learned by trial and error, and conversed with their colleagues. This study is significant because I had access to Dr. Hensen, an experienced professor who is recognized as a highly successful teacher by his colleagues, and students. I wanted to learn about the methods, language, and approaches that he used for planning and teaching so I could build a repertoire of ideas that I might use to become an effective university instructor. In addition to reading about various paradigms and theoretical constructs concerning teaching at the university level, I actually observed and conversed
with Dr. Hensen about his teaching in a viable setting. From our conversations I could choose practices and approaches that I would like to adapt, assimilate, or incorporate into my teaching. I do not mean to convey that I would by-pass the necessity of my own experiences and development as a university teacher. In fact, part of my development will consist of a continued examination and evaluation of the ideas I obtained. I will have to determine which ideas will be beneficial as I explore creating environments for student learning. However, such information may assist me in starting at a higher, more effective instructional level than I would otherwise.

Dr. Hensen and I were teacher educators who decided to talk about instruction. We both thought conversation might be helpful in our teaching. In this study I examine the conversations that took place as Dr. Hensen and I worked collaboratively to develop an undergraduate reading assessment course. In particular, I describe in detail the conversations that took place in four of our planning session meetings, the teaching he did subsequent to those meetings, and the debriefings. The settings in which we engaged were important learning settings to me. Therefore, I thought it would be useful to look closely at how the conversations in those settings related to what Dr. Hensen did in class. Additionally, I examined my beliefs and what I learned about university teaching from our conversations.
There are not many opportunities for teachers to converse about their teaching. Clark and Lampert (1986) noted that one problem confronting institutions of education today is that teachers tend to work in isolation. Much of the information about teachers' successes and the mechanisms of their successes is lost due to a lack of opportunities, or a clear means, to share and communicate with one another. This idea served as a catalyst to my recognizing that access not only to the mind, but the doing of an experienced professor could greatly enhance my knowledge about university teaching.

In this study I explored the nature of the conversations in which Dr. Hensen and I engaged to answer the following questions.

1. What happened during the planning sessions, the class meetings, and the debriefings?
2. How did Dr. Hensen use the conversations to further develop his teaching?
3. How did the conversations relate to my learning?
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

In this chapter I will present a biographical sketch of Vygotsky, a brief historical perspective of the time in which he lived, a description of his theoretical construct, and a discussion of current research related to his theory.

Biographical Sketch of Vygotsky

Lev Semenovich Vygotsky (1896-1934) was a Soviet psychologist who was very influential in Russian psychology during the 1920's and early 1930's until his untimely death due to tuberculosis (Bruner, 1962). During his life Vygotsky wrote over 180 works. He was an innovator in many fields (psychology, education, medicine, law, literature) and was the center of an intellectual circle known as the "troika" (Blanck, 1990; Wertsch, 1985b). He has also been referred to as a cultural theorist, a semiotician, and a scholar (Bruner, 1962, & 1984; Cole & Scribner, 1978; and Wertsch, 1985b). Much of what we know about Vygotsky's early life is sketchy (Wertsch, 1985b). However, Wertsch provided a great deal of information about Vygotsky's life which is based on conversations he had with Vygotsky's friends and acquaintances while visiting Russia. The following is a summary of highlights of Vygtosky's life based upon Wertsch's descriptions.

Vygotsky graduated from a Jewish gymnasium school in
1913 with a gold medal and was recognized as an outstanding student. Still, he had difficulty getting into the university of his choice because he was Jewish. Quotas and casting lots were the methods for admitting Jews to the universities of Moscow and Saint Petersburg at that time. Vygotsky was ultimately admitted to Moscow University to study medicine, even though medicine was not his priority. He was more interested in history and philology (historical and comparative linguistics), but openings in these areas were reserved for the preparation of secondary teachers. This created a problem for Vygotsky because Jews were not allowed to be an employee of tsarist Russia. Vygotsky also had a great interest in law. Shortly after entering Moscow University he switched his concentration from medicine to law and graduated in 1917 from Moscow University with a law degree. He attended Shanyavskii University while concurrently attending Moscow University, but did not receive an official degree from Shanyavskii because it was not considered an official institution (Wertsch, 1985b; and Blanck, 1990). He did however profit greatly from his studies in psychology, philosophy, and literature while a student at Shanyavskii (Wertsch, 1985b).

On January 6, 1924 Vygotsky attended the Second All-Russian Psychoneurological Congress in Leningrad and presented his "Methods of Reflexological and Psychological Investigations." The director of the Psychological Institute
was so impressed with what Vygotsky had to say that he invited Vygotsky to join in the restructuring of the institution (Wertsch, 1985b). This was a turning point in Vygotsky's life as he began systematic work in psychology (Bruner, 1962). He fervently read the psychological materials that were available at the institution. In 1925, Vygotsky completed his dissertation, "The Psychology of Art" (Wertsch, 1985b). Also in 1925 he established what became the Scientific Research Institute of Defectology of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. This institute was an outgrowth of Vygotsky's concern for hearing impaired and mentally retarded children.

It is also important, and of interest, to note that Vygotsky's passions included the theater and literature, which he often referenced in his writings. In fact, amongst his first eight writings on psychology, Vygotsky discussed problems in education and included an emphasis on methods of teaching literature (Moll, 1990). Wertsch provided a description of what Vygotsky's years were like between 1924 and 1934. He said:

The years between 1924 and 1934 were extremely busy and productive for Vygotsky. Soon after his arrival in Moscow, Alexander Romanovich Luria (1902-1977) and Aleksei Nikolaevich Leont'ev (1904-1979) joined him as students and colleagues. Together these three became known as the "troika" of the Vygotskian
school. Several other students and followers eventually joined the school, but it was Luria and Leont'ev who were destined to be the major developers of Vygotsky's ideas after his death (Wertsch, 1985b, p. 9).

**Historical Perspective**

Vygotsky was influenced by many people and events during his time. Many of these were noted by Cole and Scribner (1978). First, Vygotsky was a student when Wilhelm Wundt, the founder of experimental psychology and William James, the American pragmatist were popular. Second, Vygotsky's "scientific contemporaries included Ivan Pavlov, Valdimir Bekhterev, and John B. Watson, popularizers of stimulus response theories of behavior, as well as Wertheimer, Kohler, Koffka, and Lewin, the founders of the Gestalt psychology movement" (p.1). Third, Vygotsky was influenced by "western European sociologists and anthropologists like Thurnwald and Levy-Bruhl who were interested in the history of mental processes as reconstructed from anthropological evidence of the intellectual activity of primitive people" (p.9). Fourth, Soviet linguists such as Sapir/Whorf, who were interested in problems of the origin of language and its influence on the development of thought, also influenced Vygotsky. Fifth, the sociopolitical conditions in the Soviet Union reflected a great emphasis on science to solve economic and social problems. Clearly Vygotsky had contact with many intellectual contemporaries who influenced him.
Additionally, Vygotsky was influenced by the state of European psychology which provided the initial setting for his theories. The conditions of society in postrevolutionary Russia influenced Vygotsky too and were the sources of immediate problems facing him as well as a source of inspiration (Cole and Scribner, 1978). Postrevolutionary Russia was dedicated to formulating and promoting a behavioral, Marxist theory of psychology. Thus, reflective of the time, Vygotsky and his colleagues sought to develop a Marxist theory of human intellectual functioning. However, Vygotsky dissented from the newly established authority. He made it clear in his speeches and publications that he viewed the existing schools of psychology as inadequate for the task of providing a firm foundation for establishing a unified theory of human psychological processes.

Vygotsky's Gestalt contemporaries were also sensing a need for change but held a different view from Vygotsky. The Gestalts believed a crisis existed because established theories could not explain complex perceptual and problem solving behaviors, particularly Wundt's and Watsonian behaviorism. Vygotsky believed that the crisis was much deeper. "He felt that the Gestalt psychologists failed to move beyond the description of complex phenomena to the explanation of them" (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p.5). As a result of this view Vygotsky sought a comprehensive approach
that would make possible description and explanation of higher psychological functions (Cole & Scribner, 1978).

**Vygotsky's Theoretical Construct**

During the 1920's and early 1930's Vygotsky developed the theory of "the zone of proximal development" (ZPD) which is pertinent to education today and is also the "connecting" concept in his work (Moll, 1990; Wertsch, 1984, 1985a, 1985b, 1991). Vygotsky defined the zone of proximal development as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (1978, p. 86). The basis for the ZPD was Vygotsky's interest in the relationship between a child's individual level of development ("actual development") and the level at which s/he can function while participating in instructional social interaction ("potential development") (Rogoff & Wertsch, 1984). In such settings an individual receives help and support from another person who is more knowledgeable or experienced. The individual is then able to perform a task that s/he would not have been able to do alone. This type of interaction is thought to be fundamental to the process of development and learning (Vygotsky, 1978; 1986; 1987).

However, nowhere in Vygotsky's writings did he reveal an account of what constitutes "problem solving under adult
guidance or in collaboration with some capable peers" (Wertsch, 1984). Therefore, according to Wertsch, the level of potential development and the zone of proximal development cannot be defined in any precise way. To support Vygotsky's theory, Wertsch developed three additional theoretical constructs: 1) situation definition, 2) intersubjectivity, and 3) semiotic mediation.

Wertsch uses the term "situation definition" to refer to how a situation is defined or represented by the participants operating in that setting or context. Furthermore:

The notion of situation definition is needed in any complete account of the zone of proximal development, because collaboration in this zone typically involves the adult's representing objects and events in one way and the child's representing them in another (Wertsch, 1984, p.9).

Wertsch noted that humans are not passive recipients in settings, but actively create a representation of a situation through collaboration. The meaning attached to a situation by an individual participant (his/her situation definition) must change during the process of interaction if growth or learning is to develop while in the zone of proximal development. This growth can not be accounted for solely in terms of quantitative increments, that is simply rearranging variables or simply saying, "do it this way."
Rather the learner must give up his/her intrapsychological situation definition for a more qualitative, newer one: a "situation redefinition" which moves the learner away from his/her "actual development" toward his/her "potential development," toward independent problem solving.

Intersubjectivity, the second theoretical construct Wertsch presented to assist our understanding of the zone of proximal development, exists between two interlocutors in a task setting when they share the same situation definition" (Wertsch, 1984, p.12). In other words, when people take part in dialogue or conversation, they often share the same individual situation definition. At such time there is dialogue, but no zone of proximal development. The participants have the same understanding or interpretation of an event. However, intersubjectivity may be achieved within the intrapsychological plane of the learner or the learned. When intersubjectivity is not present, the participants engaged in the dialogue are able to negotiate an intersubjective definition that differs from their way(s) of understanding in a situation on the intrapsychological plane. Such negotiations may be asymmetrical, that is the intrapsychological understanding of one participant (the learned) may be temporarily suspended in order to carry out a communicative task of bringing the learner closer to the point of understanding, to the level of his/her potential development. The learned creates
intersubjectivity. If necessary, the learned will achieve intersubjectivity via relating meaning through the learner's intrapsychological plane, i.e., move toward sharing by using the situation definitions of the learner as a starting point. Upon achieving intersubjectivity by means of semiotic mediation the learner may be shifted through levels of the zone of proximal development toward those situational definitions framed within the intrapsychological plane of the learned. When intersubjectivity is thus achieved, the learner's potential development will be made manifest.

Rogoff's (1990) interpretation of intersubjectivity provides further clarification. She notes that "the process of communication, whether verbal or nonverbal, is a social activity that can be regarded as their bridge between one understanding of a situation and another" (p.71). Rogoff defines intersubjectivity as a "shared understanding based on a common focus of attention and some presuppositions that form the ground for communication" (p.71).

Intersubjectivity is most often created through the use of language. It can be established when appropriated forms of semiotic mediation are used during communication. That is to say that signs (such as speech or conversation) can be used to mediate learning. Signs play a fundamental role in Vygotsky's overall theoretical approach. Vygotsky noted that sign systems and tool systems are created by societies over the course of human history and change with
the form of society and the level of its cultural
development. He believed that the internalization of
culturally produced sign systems brings about behavioral
transformations. This internalization also forms the bridge
between early and later forms of individual development
(Cole & Scribner, 1978).

The theoretical constructs of situation definition,
intersubjectivity, and semiotic mediation in conjunction
with Vygotsky's "zone of proximal development" support the
view that learning is an internalization of sustained social
practices where assisted performance recurs before
psychological change or transformations take place. One
way to assist sustained social practice is to use
conversation as a mediator.

**Current Research**

Much of Vygotsky's work was rediscovered in the West
in the 1960's. The notions of the unity of cognition and
behavior; the social origin of individual behavior; different
modes of speech in child development; and cross-cultural
and literacy studies became popular (Kozulin, 1990).

Vygotsky has been a prominent figure in American
psychology since his monograph *Thought and Language* was
published in 1962 (Cole, John-Steiner, Scribner, Souberman,
1978). This monograph was Vygotsky's attempt to combine
his separate essays into a coherent whole (Bruner, 1962).
It did not appear until a few months after Vygotsky's death
in 1934 and was subsequently suppressed in 1936 in the USSR for political reasons. It did not reappear until 1956, yet still had a great influence on a generation of Russian psychologists (Bruner, 1962; Wertsch, 1985b).

Prior to the translation of *Thought and Language* there were no extended writings of Vygotsky available in English, with the exception of a few short articles (Bruner, 1987). Since then several writers have broadened and supported Vygotsky's work. Rogoff and Wertsch (1984) outlined some of the related research:

Wood and Bruner and their colleagues (Wood, 1980; Wood and others, 1976; Wood and others 1978) developed the closely related notion of "scaffolding," a process wherein an adult provides support to a child learning to master a problem.

This and other related research in the West has begun to identify a number of processes in individual functioning that appear to be facilitated by social guidance. For example, the argument has been applied to language and skill acquisition (Bruner, 1975; Greenfield in press; Kaye and Charney, 1980; Scollon, 1976; Zukow & others, 1982) the production of narrative (McNamee, 1981), to reading (Au and Kawakami in press; Cadzen, 1979; Tharp and others in press), to the development of game scripts (Hodapp & Goldfield, 1983; Zukow, 1983), to memory (Rogoff & Gardner in press),
and to problem solving (Ellis & Rogoff in press; Wertsch, 1979) (1984, p. 4).

In addition to these studies Wertsch (1984) also noted that Vygotsky's work has been incorporated into studies on intelligence testing (Brown & Ferrara in press; Campione, Brown, Ferrara, & Bryant, 1984).

Vygotsky's theoretical ramifications have more recently been interpreted and applied by Tharp and Gallimore (1988) and Newman, Griffin, and Cole (1989); researchers who have focused on contemporary issues of education in the United States (Moll, 1990). Vygotsky's ideas were used by Tharp and Gallimore to present an interactionist theory of development which involves what they call "activity settings." According to Tharp and Gallimore, activity settings may be viewed as:

The contexts in which collaborative interaction, intersubjectivity, and assisted performance occur .... They are the who, what, when, where, and why, the small recurrent dramas of everyday life, played on the stages of home, school, community, and workplace .... (p.72). This description implies that activity settings have a cognitive-motoric component and a social component. Tharp and Gallimore clarified it this way:

The name "activity settings" incorporates cognitive and motoric action itself (activity), as well as the external, environmental, and objective features of
the occasion (settings). For example, learning centers in classrooms that allow peer assistance can be activity settings that have specific purposes, occasions, and participants. Independent self-study groups for teachers are activity settings, with goals, values, collaborative activity, and spatial locus (p. 72).

Examples of various activity settings which exemplify the interactionist theory can be found in Tharp and Gallimore's descriptions of the development of the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP). The goal of KEEP was to improve the cognitive and educational development of ethnic minority children who were considered at risk. Several Vygotskian ideas were basic to this focus. For example, the school emphasized natural teaching and learning through interactions in social contexts. To accomplish this goal the focus was placed on creating classroom activity settings and program development activity settings. Within these settings techniques were identified to assist the performance of program developers, consultants/trainers, teachers, and students. Activity settings could be developed around any of the following: observation and conference, peer coaching, self examination of videotapes of one's teaching, floor training (a consultant demonstrates a lesson, the teacher observes and a discussion follows), university courses (particularly ones that provide opportunities for teachers to develop projects to solve problems in their
own classrooms), and teacher workshops.

KEEP has been recognized as a highly successful program that was developed to ameliorate the poor reading and high incidence of failure among native Polynesian-Hawaiian children in Hawaii (Anderson, Armbruster, & Roe, 1991). The program "makes integral use of modeling, coaching, and scaffolding for educating children, training their teachers, and training "consultants" who provide continuing training for the teachers" (p. 198). For example, in training teachers the program focused on creating a social context in which teachers were assisted in their development. Instead of the usual social isolation where teachers worked alone in their classroom, teachers were provided opportunities to interact with peers and consultants. Observations were followed by conferences, peer coaching, and videotapes to assist teachers in their development.

Newman, Griffin, and Cole (1989) used Vygotsky's construct of the zone of proximal development as a theoretical basis for their "construction zone." Many of the characteristics of this zone are similar to ideas that Tharp and Gallimore had regarding activity settings and assisted performance.

The "construction zone" is "a magic place where minds meet, where things are not the same to all who see them, where meanings are fluid, and where one person's construal may preempt another's" (White, 1989, p. ix). In the
construction zone cognitive change is considered as much a social as individual process. Laboratories, classrooms, and other real settings were used to create an atmosphere (a zone) where individuals could be engaged in complex shared activities with one another. This allows individuals to appropriate each others thinking which in turn provokes new meanings and understandings (Newman, Griffin, and Cole, 1989). Individuals are supported by one another and are then able to go beyond what they could have done on their own.

Conversations were important in mediating and facilitating learning in Vygotsky's "zone of proximal development," Tharp and Gallimore's "activity settings," and Newman, Griffin, and Cole's "construction zone."

Conversation as a tool for learning continues to be of interest to researchers. Linguists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, teachers, and educationalists are focusing more and more on observing and analyzing classroom talk (Edwards & Mercer, 1987). Edwards and Mercer discussed the approaches that researchers are taking in these disciplines. I will briefly summarize the key points. Linguists approach the study of classroom talk from the perspective of discourse analysis. They are interested in form more than content. For example, linguists would want to know how language is organized in units larger than sentences. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) work (cited
by Edwards & Mercer, 1987) had a great impact on how teaching and learning in secondary classrooms could be analyzed and categorized. They identified an exchange structure which consisted of: an initiation by the teacher, which elicits a response by the student, and is followed by feedback from the teacher. This structure influenced other linguists who were interested in classroom conversations. Still, formal discourse analysis had limitations because the situations being analyzed were devised to reveal linguistic structures.

In the past psychologists focused heavily on the assessment of individual abilities, aptitudes, behaviors, and attitudes. More recently, developmental psychology (influenced by the work of Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky) has directed attention to a more interactional analyses of the processes of learning and teaching, including talk.

Sociological and anthropological approaches to classroom talk were also limited until recently because researchers in these areas were more interested in "structural functionalism." That is they focused on issues like the relation between students' social-class backgrounds and their eventual levels of achievement. At the end of the sixties, many changes took place in the sociological field. Structural functionalism became disestablished and a variety of alternatives surfaced. Emphasis shifted to recognizing that human beings play an active role in creating,
interpreting, and recreating their social role. Therefore, new research methods were needed. Ethnographic methods, originally used by anthropologists, became one of the new methods for sociologists. Obviously, attention was directed to the classroom as a setting for education sociologists to apply the new approaches. Classroom talk then became one area of focus. It was analyzed not for its linguistic structure, but for the content (what people talked about) and patterning (who talks to whom).

Many classroom interactions have been observed and analyzed by educational researchers as well. More and more studies are focusing on an interest "in what people say to each other, what they talk about, what words they use, what understandings they convey, and with the problematics of how these understandings are established and built upon as the discourse proceeds" (Edwards & Mercer, p. 10, 1987).

Earlier research on classroom talk revealed that the major percentage of the talk that occurs in a classroom is done by the teacher (Goodlad, 1984). However, more recently, the literature reports that other kinds of conversational opportunities are surfacing for educators and others concerned about education. For example, research highlights the significance of conversation in creating school improvement. The following excerpt from "It's About Time," the report of the Time Committee of the National Education Association's National Center for Innovation
Current research reveals unequivocally that time for collaboration, dialogue, and reflection among professionals is essential. Discussions with practitioners reaffirm that the single most important and necessary resource for effective school improvement is time with colleagues: Time to examine, time to debate, time to reflect (VA Journal of Education, 1994). Conversation is also being researched relative to how it contributes to the formation and maintenance of learning communities for teacher research. It was found that particular ways of describing, discussing, and debating teaching was critical to the process. Through conversation, teachers are able to make their tacit knowledge known (Polanyi, 1958), and call into question their assumptions about common practice (Giroux, 1984). Two interrelated ways of conversing proved important to building communities for teacher research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993), the notion of "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) and critique. Through rich descriptive talk teachers make their day to day events and practices of teaching and learning visible and accessible. Cochran-Smith and Lytle pointed out that when teachers use conversation to critique they "question common practice, deliberate about what is regarded as expert knowledge, examine underlying assumptions, interrogate educational categories, and attempt to uncover
the values and interests served by the common arrangements and structures of schooling" (Beyer, 1986; Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Smyth, 1987; Zeichner, 1986).

Hollingsworth (1992) examined ongoing conversations of three cohorts of preservice and beginning elementary teachers. She found that collaborative conversations were helpful in facilitating and studying beginning elementary teachers' learning. Her work also highlighted some of the contributions that feminist research is making to the field. Another study related to beginning teachers was conducted by Waite (1993). He examined five teacher-supervisor conferences and their contexts. Waite was interested in making sense of the behaviors and orientations of teachers and supervisors in conference.

Studies like those discussed above indicate that conversations of people in various educational settings contribute greatly to our understandings of the issues and concerns that educators consistently face.
Chapter 3

Method

This chapter explains how this study was conducted. The descriptions include how access was gained for the study, who the participants were, and the procedures used for collecting and analyzing the data.

Site Access

Access for this study was not difficult to gain. I learned from my advisor that Dr. Hensen was interested in studying his own teaching and that he thought working with a colleague might facilitate his endeavors. Therefore, I decided to talk with Dr. Hensen to see if he would be willing to participate in a dissertation study with me to examine how conversation might be used to facilitate teacher learning. I could analyze the conversations of our planning sessions, his teaching subsequent to those sessions, and the debriefings. Additionally I could acquire ideas that might enhance my own teaching and learning.

I met with Dr. Hensen to discuss the possibilities of this dissertation study. We discussed several issues. Included were: reasons to participate in the study, concerns relative to the time that may be required, and the possible roles we each would take throughout the study.

Dr. Hensen offered several reasons for accepting participation in the study. Among these were:
1) looking reflectively at his teaching,
2) focusing on what his students were learning,
3) having access to a classroom teacher's brain,
4) planning without procrastination.

Additionally, he informed me that his decision to participate was influenced by his respect for me as a classroom teacher and teacher educator with whom he could have meaningful conversations. He said our conversations would help him acquire the kind of information that would better inform his teaching decisions.

As a beginning qualitative researcher I would be able to examine how an experienced teacher educator structures learning environments for students. At the same time I would observe him as he taught and implemented his plans. Furthermore, this study would enable me to make a positive transition from teaching at the elementary level to teaching higher education.

Dr. Hensen and I decided to meet weekly for a planning session, the class meeting, and for a "debriefing" following each class. We concluded that audio recording our conversations would develop a good representation of our processes and interactions.

Participants

Dr. Hensen and I were the major participants in this study. Therefore, this section includes a biographical sketch of Dr. Hensen and an autobiographical sketch of me
to better inform the reader (Liptak, 1990) of our professional backgrounds and expertise. Wertsch (1991) noted that Vygotskian scholars like Norris Minick (1987) have argued that actions and mental functions of an individual are linked to cultural, historical, and institutional contexts. Therefore, biographies provide information which broadens the reader's perspective on the issues presented in the research.

Dr. Hensen

Dr. Hensen is a Professor of Education at a large university in the southeastern part of the United States. He is well recognized by colleagues and students for his contributions to the field of education. He is an experienced teacher of many years, is very knowledgeable about research in the field due to extensive reading and conference participation, and is himself a researcher. Throughout the academic year he shares his knowledge about teacher growth and reflection by presenting his work at various national, state, and local conferences.

Dr. Hensen has received several awards in recognition of his teaching. During his first five years at the university where he now teaches he received the college's outstanding teaching award each of those years. He then received the University Wine Award in 1980 and thus became a member of the Academy of Teaching Excellence. Additionally, he received the Outstanding Teacher Award for Virginia in
1989, given by the Virginia Association of Teacher Educators

Dr. Hensen completed his undergraduate work in 1967 at a state teacher's college in New York and started his teaching career in the fall of that year. He taught two different grade levels his first year; fourth grade for the first half of the year, and sixth grade science during the second half. He welcomed the science teaching because science was his minor in college and it was a strong interest of his.

After his first year of teaching Dr. Hensen decided to go back to school full time to pursue a masters degree in reading. He noted two reasons for that decision: 1) he wanted to acquire a specialist degree and 2) he wanted to learn more about reading. Therefore, he began to work on his degree in the summer of 1968. While working on his master's degree he took another teaching position in the spring of 1969. He said, "you could get a job easily" then. He continued working on the masters degree as he taught, and completed it in the summer of 1969. Dr. Hensen then accepted a full time position teaching. He noted that this was a time when he tried out many of the ideas that he had been exposed to in his course work.

Following a year of teaching sixth grade, Dr. Hensen became a Chapter I itinerant reading teacher in two small rural schools for one year. Federal monies were not available for the Chapter I position for the 1971-1972 school
term, so he took a job with another school division as a teacher and teacher leader for reading and language arts. He noted that this experience created opportunities for him to work with teachers and support them in their work. According to Dr. Hensen, little attention had been devoted to teacher learning throughout his training, yet he had "lots of collaborative work with teachers."

At the end of that academic year in 1972, Dr. Hensen decided to go back to graduate school to work on a doctorate in reading. He had been taking courses all along, but decided to devote a full time year to work in this area. Dr. Hensen stated that the doctoral program heavily involved him in research that was experimentally based, but also provided some strategies for application.

The early seventies brought attention to the psycholinguistic movement which Dr. Hensen noted had heavily impacted his graduate work and the early parts of his career at the university where he now teaches. Frank Smith's writing and understanding of reading in particular influenced him in terms of the kinds of tasks he designed for his students and his belief relative to how people learn.

After a full year of doctoral studies Dr. Hensen became a diagnostician at a university supported clinic. He described this clinic as a demonstration center which "created an environment for a multidisciplinary team in terms of diagnosis." Dr. Hensen said he had plenty of
opportunities for collaborative work and team problem solving with teachers while working at this clinic. Also, in reference to his work at the clinic, Dr. Hensen said, "In the early seventies we did a lot of early work on notions of trial teaching and on line assessment rather than using tests as assessment because the kids we worked with were such complex cases, the [standardized] tests were kind of meaningless."

When Dr. Hensen completed his doctoral degree he accepted a position as a resource room teacher in a school district teaching math and reading. Then in 1974 a position opened at the university where he now teaches. He interviewed for the job and accepted the position because it was field based. That is to say the position allowed him to design tasks for teachers and student teachers that relate to their own classroom experiences. In turn, he would be more informed about actual classroom practices. He said, "I immediately saw just how little I knew about how teachers learned and what they really needed to know to teach. And [I] struggled with that for quite a long time ...." With this awareness, Dr. Hensen set out to try and figure out how to create environments that would be sensible and meaningful for teachers. Such environments would utilize what he was discovering about how teachers learn and would provide teachers with practical experiences. He said:
I experimented, and experimented, and experimented, trying different things. I've tried to construct whole conceptual models [with] groups of people, and spent hours and hours and hours and not having it work."

Later, Dr. Hensen and a colleague talked about what he was trying to accomplish and decided to let it "emerge rather than try to design it." Instead of creating conceptual models, he would let them emerge from the experiences and questions that teachers brought to the course. This worked well for him as evidenced by his comment, "That was the most success that I experienced."

About four or five years ago Dr. Hensen began focusing on his reading diagnosis course as a teacher thinking course. He began constructing opportunities for his students to think about teaching, "using reading as a vehicle." As Dr. Hensen talked about creating these environments for his students he expressed his feelings about literacy. He said:

... I didn't have a commitment to literacy that I think a lot of people have that come into reading ..., I saw the development of literacy as one of the biggest repressors that existed in schools. And so my objective was to help kids defend themselves against that.

... I wasn't particularly confident about my writing and I wasn't particularly an avid reader.
Literature wasn't a big influence in my life. I've read a number of books and been influenced by them, but it wasn't as if, is English your favorite subject? No it's not, it's my least favorite. Science was my favorite subject. I loved teaching math the most and was fascinated by history and social studies. I would rate English and language arts last. I went into it for as I say for practical reasons. I knew the least about it. The way the field was set up, it was okay, I could operate in it. It allowed me to help others learn, and how to do that, became my goal.

This philosophy about literacy has a definite influence on his work. Dr. Hensen went on to say:

If you trace the history of my work, first I investigated the reading process. Then I moved to a segment where I began to look at how teachers use an understanding of the reading process to make instructional decisions. Next I moved to a third segment that looks at how teachers acquire information that allows them to help others learn to read. ... I leave the strategy development to other people. I would never be a person to end up developing a KWL or DRTA. But there's a lot of people out there who don't understand how to create environments for people to use that sort of strategy in their classes. And I think that's what I have some
In addition to developing his courses and teaching, Dr. Hensen was involved in other activities of the university. He frequently participated on promotion and tenure committees. He stated that such demands "begin to draw you away from your teaching because they pull you into other missions of the university more heavily." He was also responsible for running a model for the student teaching program and served as program area leader in the department of elementary education.

The college of education offers several different "models" for students to choose from for their student teaching experience. The faculty works closely with school divisions in nearby counties and cities to establish teaching models that represent rural, suburban, and urban environments. During the academic year of this study Dr. Hensen "ran" a model in which students worked in a suburban area. He was responsible for keeping the twenty-six students in this model informed about issues related to their program. These issues included information such as: available seminars; important dates (like interviews, graduation, conferences, etc.); changes in scheduled meetings; certification for teaching; class parties; and evaluations of the student teaching experience. Additionally, throughout the semester, Dr. Hensen visited the students and principals in the schools where the students were placed.
for their student teaching. Dr. Hensen viewed his overall responsibility relative to the model as seeing that the "model ran smoothly and that the students had a rich professional experience." Prior to this academic term, he had run three different models in suburban and rural areas.

More recently, Dr. Hensen has been focusing on his teaching. "Moving his teaching forward," creating new tasks for his students, and learning more, all required him to keep current with what is occurring in public school classrooms today. To keep current he recently participated in a summer writing workshop and returned to an elementary school to do some teaching. Dr. Hensen said he viewed such activities as a part of professional development that he must undertake in order to develop relevance in his instruction. He elaborated, "I think teaching is changing in the elementary school, drastically in reading and language arts and I need to experience some of the pressures that today's classroom teacher is under."

Charles Lucado

I completed the requirements for a BA degree in Elementary Education in the spring of 1973 and was certified to teach grades 4-7. A sixth grade teaching position opened in the school where I completed student teaching. I applied for the position and was hired to teach sixth grade. I remained at this school for eight years until I transferred
to another elementary school in the same county. I taught sixth grade the first four years of my elementary school teaching and fifth grade thereafter. During that time I taught in a variety of settings. I taught all subjects in a self-contained classroom; all subjects in a combined fifth-sixth grade; science in a departmentalized instruction setting; math in a departmentalized setting; and various combinations of these. I changed from sixth grade to fifth when the sixth grade students were moved from the elementary school to the junior high school.

I worked hard to become the best elementary school teacher I could. I served as chairman of two self studies for accreditation by the Southern Association; was grade level chairman for many of those years; participated in numerous workshops and inservices; was a member and representative for the local education association; and was a member of the local reading association.

After teaching three years, I entered a program to work on the Master of Arts in Education degree. I continued teaching during each school year as I took classes, and attended classes in the summers until I completed the degree. Eight years later, I entered a doctoral program. Since then I have had several experiences which have contributed immensely to my professional growth. The course work in my program of study broadened my perspectives on teaching and on research. I acquired many new teaching strategies
and learned about qualitative research methods. Other learning experiences included participation in "The Reading to Learn Summer Institute"; supervision of student teachers; teaching undergraduate courses in developmental reading, reading assessment, and curriculum instruction in social studies; and collaboration with faculty in writing a paper "Learning to be Reflective: The Thinking Process of Student Teachers Involved in a Course on Reading Diagnosis."

Additionally, I assisted my advisor in teaching a graduate course entitled, "Comprehending Processes & Reading in the Content Areas"

I have been fortunate to have the opportunities and experiences I had throughout my teaching career. Those experiences, and the desire to be one of the best in my profession, have helped me grow professionally and develop a reputation as a master teacher. I have a genuine interest in teaching. Whenever I hear about a movie, television program, or book related to teaching, it immediately catches my attention. I must "check it out."

I could not begin to name all of the movies and books I have enjoyed, but some include: Conrack, a movie based on the book The Water is Wide by Pat Conroy; To Sir With Love by E. R. Braithwaite; The Paper Chase by John Jay Osborn, Jr.; Stand and Deliver by Ramon Menendez & Tom Musca; Totto-Chan: The Little Girl at the Window by Tetsuko Kuroyanagi, Translated by Dorothy Britton; and Dead Poets
Society by N. R. Kleinbaum. I have literally developed a home library with a heavy focus on educational topics. Many of the books in this library are the result of many enjoyable moments of browsing antique shops, yard sales, and flea markets. I am fascinated by old texts on curriculum and education. It is surprising how similar many of the ideas of days gone by resurface in current literature.

Through the years I visited many colleague's classrooms to talk about teaching and to share ideas. I have had conversations with different grade level teachers about how they plan, how they organize their children for instruction, the kinds of materials they use, and their personal philosophies about education, among many other topics. Such conversations enhanced my learning about teaching greatly. The conversations led me think about my own teaching and build a repertoire of ideas and strategies to improve my teaching.

One of my greatest strengths in teaching has been (and still is) the ability to create atmospheres of mutual respect. I discovered that mutual respect is enhanced when a teacher demonstrates a genuine interest in and concern for each individual student's development. As a classroom teacher, I always tried to treat students like I would like to be treated. I often asked myself, "how would I like to be a student in my classroom?"

I view myself as a facilitator of learning, constantly
seeking ways to make learning exciting, interesting, and challenging. This study provided me an opportunity to explore my beliefs and ideas even more deeply.

**Data Gathering**

The researcher plays a very important role in qualitative research. S/he not only collects and analyzes the data, but brings meaning to the research from his/her own experiences and perceptions. Merriam (1988) noted some characteristics which support the importance of the researcher.

Certain characteristics differentiate the human researcher from other data collection instruments: The researcher as instrument is responsive to the context; he or she can adapt techniques to the circumstances; the total context can be considered; what is known about the situation can be expanded through sensitivity to nonverbal aspects; the human instrument can process data immediately, can clarify and summarize as the study evolves, and can explore anomalous responses (Guba and Lincoln, 1981).

Qualitative data is the source of well grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts; it preserves the chronological flow of events; and is likely to lead to serendipitous findings and new theoretical integrations (Miles & Huberman, 1984). It includes detailed descriptions of situations, events,
people, interactions, and observed behaviors (Patton, 1980).

The data for this study were gathered over an eight week period. Following a discussion with Dr. Hensen about the possibility of this dissertation study, I began audio taping our conversations in order to have enough data to construct a substantial understanding of the events that were taking place. This was a concern for me because the reading assessment class started prior to Christmas vacation.

I met weekly with Dr. Hensen for eight weeks as he planned for his reading assessment class and attended each class session he taught. I also met with him following each class session for a "debrief" so we could discuss the class session and his plans. We met again, three weeks after the classes, to discuss the portfolio tasks the students completed during the course. Two months later, we met for a follow up discussion about the study (See Appendix A). Information was recorded by audio taping the planning sessions, the class sessions, the debriefs, and the follow up sessions. Audio taping is a popular research method because it can easily monitor all conversations, it is versatile, and it provides ample material for study (Hopkins, 1985).

Data also included documents such as: (a) notes that were made by Dr. Hensen as he planned for the course; (b) my notes of the planning sessions; and (c) handouts that were generated for the course.
I transcribed all of the audio tapes for the planning sessions, classroom observations, and debriefing sessions in which Dr. Hensen and I participated. I chose to do this because it would intensify my knowledge of the data and because the researcher usually is more accurate in transcribing than a typist (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

In addition to the data sources mentioned, my conversations with Dr. Hensen at the end of the course helped clarify issues that surfaced as a concern. Much of the information obtained at that meeting was also used to develop the biographical sketch of his work.

**Data Analysis**

"Analysis is the process of bringing order to the data, organizing what is there into patterns, and basic descriptive units" (Patton, 1980, p. 286). It is a way of thinking that is a systematic examination of something to determine its parts, and their relationship to the whole (Spradley, 1980). A major part of analysis is reducing the data (Miles and Huberman, 1984). These researchers view the process of analysis as sharpening, focusing, and organizing the data. Yet, data reduction is more than just a process of breaking the data down into more manageable parts. The process includes a transforming of the "raw" data into a more comprehensible, concise rendition. It organizes the data so that "final" conclusions can be drawn and verified (Miles and Huberman, 1984). This process is carried out
by selecting what is observed and/or recorded, through summaries and paraphrasing, and by being subsumed in larger patterns. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) clarified the process, saying:

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other materials that you accumulate to increase your own understanding of them and to enable you to present what you have discovered to others (emphasis mine). Analysis involves working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others ....

As is the case in many qualitative research studies, this study generated a wealth of information. I analyzed the data with an intent to better understand the conversations and interactions that took place during the four selected planning sessions, class meetings, and debriefings. I also examined how the conversations related to Dr. Hensen's instruction and to my learning.

At this point I will elaborate on the process that I engaged in as I began the analysis. While transcribing the classroom observations I indicated the amount of time that the students were engaged in classroom tasks as they worked on the task. However, I did not have any systematic
representation of the whole class process relative to time, nor did I have any representation of time for the planning sessions or debriefs. Therefore, to ameliorate this situation, I listened again to all of the tapes, timed them, and marked the transcriptions at one minute intervals. This process created a third tangible confrontation with the data. The first confrontation was when I observed and taped the sessions, the second when I transcribed the tapes, and third when I timed them. This was a very informative process because it acquainted me thoroughly with the data.

I felt that I still needed to gain a deeper understanding of the content. I realized that much more work was needed before I could begin to recognize the themes embedded in the data and come to some understanding of those themes. Thus I began another undertaking with the transcriptions.

I took a closer look at the first transcription sequence which included the first planning session, the classroom observation that followed that planning session, and the debriefing session. This interaction with the data helped me establish a framework for analyzing the sequences that followed. I read through the three sessions and highlighted significant points or key ideas. Additionally I wrote brief comments in the margins that reflected the topic of discussion. As I read through the transcriptions, I noticed how natural conversation encompasses a fair amount of
repetition and verbiage. This reading also helped me focus more on the key points in the discourse because repetition can be an indicator of what is salient to the speaker. Still there was a great amount of information embedded within those key points that were spread throughout the ninety-two pages of this first sequence. I decided one way to gain a better grasp on all of this information would be to outline the data. So my next step involved outlining the first sequence.

Outlining the data helped me chunk information into categories according to topics or themes. While reading the data I realized how sections emerged related to a particular topic. I mentally talked to myself as I went through the data noting when the conversation switched from one topic to another, thus creating headings for the outline. I also indicated the amount of time devoted to each topic. Careful attention was given to capturing all of the points within the data so as not to leave anything out. Once outlined it was easy to see that points of redundancy occurred within the data. A topic that was covered at the beginning of a session would often reappear in the middle, and then again near the end. I realized that I needed to condense the data even more.

The next venture I took with the data was to "map" it so I could see it all in front of me without having to flip from page to page in the transcriptions or
outlines. I created a map for the first sequence on 12" x 18" manila paper. I used different colors to represent the content: orange for the headings which indicated the type of session and date, purple indicated topics that were discussed in the data, pink for discussions and implementations of plans, light blue for my interpretations of salient points or beliefs that emerged in the discourse, and dark red for my interpretations of the kind of speech that was used (didactic, affirming, supportive, etc.). This process helped me further condense the data by chunking repeated topics.

The next step I took was to code the data, all 753 transcribed pages. I coded each sequence with a different color. Each sequence contained a planning session, coded a; the classroom observation, coded b; and a debriefing session, coded c. There were eight sequences plus a portfolio session and a wrap-up session. Topics in the transcripts that were generated or discussed by Dr. Hensen were indicated with an X and subscript number. Topics generated or discussed by me were coded with a Y and subscript number. Processes such as lecture, group work, or students working in pairs were coded with a Z and subscript number. This was an informative and enlightening procedure. It provided me with an index to everything that Dr. Hensen and I talked about. I could see how topics weaved in and out of the data like a thread as well as how often
they occurred.

Once the data was coded, I selected four sequences to analyze more thoroughly. I selected the first, second, fourth, and seventh sequences to describe in detail. Those four sequences are exemplary of the process in which Dr. Hensen and I engaged throughout the study. They were selected conceptually based on what was occurring in the sessions. It is important to point out that similar examples occurred in other sequences.

I chose to describe the first sequence (Planning Session 1, PS1; Class Meeting 1, CM1; and Debriefing 1, D1) because it set the stage for the following sequences. It was the first time that Dr. Hensen and I met for each session. Therefore this sequence contained a lot of information about how we organized the sessions, what the content of the sessions might be like in general, and the settings in which the sessions took place.

The second focal sequence (PS2, CM2, and D2) was chosen so that I would have a representation of consecutive sessions. Also, in the first sequence Dr. Hensen had indicated that he wanted students to be more participative in the next class, so I wanted to see if the data revealed a follow up of that desire.

The third sequence (PS4, CM4, and D4) was selected for its content. It was a sequence that strongly represented student participation. Additionally, I found the sequence
to contain several strategies that I myself would like to incorporate into my teaching that may also be of interest to others.

Finally, sequence four (PS7, CM7, and D7) was selected because it represented the development of a new topic to the course. I was particularly interested in how this sequence might differ from others since Dr. Hensen was dealing with new ideas and materials. This sequence also represented the culmination of the course.

The writing process played a major role in my interpretations. I experimented with several approaches for writing descriptions of the sessions. In fact, I struggled for quite some time about how to best represent the information I had acquired from outlining and coding the data. After several writing attempts, my advisor and I decided one way to describe the sessions would be to describe them chronologically and to focus on the content and the process within each session.

The chronological framework helped me focus the writing, but I still had to address several issues. I had to think about: what to describe, how best to describe it, how much should be included in the descriptions, writing in the active voice, how to designate the speaker, among other things. So, I wrote descriptions of each session in sequence, got feedback from my advisor, and wrote again. After many revisions of each session, the descriptions became more
refined. Once I had the four selected sequences described, my next task was to decide what was important about the information presented. What themes did I notice? What was I learning from the descriptions? What information might be of interest to others? This led me to thinking about the interpretations section of chapter 4.

To write the interpretations, I returned to the questions in chapter 1, which by the way also went through several revisions. The questions helped me focus my thinking and writing. I found it easier write and stay with a topic by using the questions as a guide. Sometimes I found myself switching to another topic as I wrote, but caught myself before I drifted too far. I remember thinking as I caught myself drifting, "this does not relate to the question, move to something else."
CHAPTER 4

Interpretations of Colleague Conversations

In this chapter I will describe the context of the planning sessions, the class meetings, and the debriefing sessions which took place in this study. I will then provide detailed chronological descriptions of the four selected planning sessions, class meetings, and debriefing sessions. The descriptions highlight what happened in each session. An interpretation of how Dr. Hensen used the planning and debriefing conversations to further develop his teaching will follow. The chapter will close with a description of how the conversations related to my learning.

Conversations of the Planning Sessions

Dr. Hensen and I met at The Pines for seven planning sessions during the semester. The Pines is an older two-story colonial brick house near the university. Faculty in the College of Education use it to conduct a reading clinic, to hold seminars, and to teach small classes. Each week Dr. Hensen and I arrived at The Pines in separate cars, usually about the same time. Typically, we got out of our cars, greeted each other, and walked to the building, talking briefly as we walked. Our talks were casual and short because the parking lot was next to the building.

All but two of the planning sessions took place on Saturday mornings. The third and fifth sessions were held on Wednesdays, one at 11:30 a.m. and the other at 11:45
a.m. All Saturday meetings started at 8:00 a.m., except the first meeting which began at 7:00 a.m. The sessions varied in length and ranged from one hour and thirty minutes to three hours and five minutes. The computed average time of the meetings was two hours and two minutes. (For a more detailed representation of the meeting times, see Appendix A.)

Saturday mornings were opportune times for the planning sessions because there were few interruptions. The atmosphere was quiet, relaxed, and comfortable. Dr. Hensen and I usually dressed casually, wearing jeans and a shirt with no tie. On the chilly mornings of January and February that we met, Dr. Hensen raised the setting on the furnace thermostat to make the room comfortable. The room had a fireplace with a mantle, but it was obvious that the fireplace was no longer used. A trash can sat in the hearth and there were no signs of carbon build up. However, I noticed that a variety of children's books were displayed on the mantle of the fireplace throughout the semester. The book arrangements were changed from time to time to reflect various activities that were occurring in the reading clinic. Additionally, samples of children's work such as semantic maps and story writing were displayed on the walls. The room was carpeted with an earth tone carpet and contained a large wooden rectangular table, several wooden oak chairs, and a chalkboard on one wall.
Dr. Hensen and I used the large rectangular table to spread out our materials as we worked during the planning sessions. He usually took some notes and books from a dark blue canvas brief case and placed them on the table, while I prepared the tape recorder to tape our session.

Once we got our materials situated and ready to use, we usually walked to the nearby 7-Eleven to get a cup of hot coffee. Sometimes we also purchased a bite to eat. This was an important part of our planning sessions because it helped establish a cordial and collegial tone. As we walked to the 7-Eleven and back we talked casually about our experiences related to teaching, our meetings, and the weather, among other topics. Later, I realized I should have recorded those conversations because some interesting ideas were discussed. I mentioned my concern to Dr. Hensen during one of our walks. He consoled me, saying that "many thoughts which occur in such conversations will resurface in later conversations." However, I wish now that I had recorded those conversations.

One form of conversation that Dr. Hensen used a lot was the "think aloud." Each planning session consisted of think alouds during which Dr. Hensen described his intentions for the class and discussed an array of other issues. The following comment from the first planning session is indicative of how the planning sessions proceeded. Dr. Hensen explained:
... let me start in terms of my lesson, ... I'm just
gonna really do a talk aloud planning session and part
of it I'll say something to you, and other times I
may not.

In addition to talking about his teaching and the upcoming
class session, Dr. Hensen sometimes wrote his main thoughts
in a notebook for future reference (See Appendix B for an
time example).

I helped maintain the conversation during the planning
sessions by interjecting comments like; "yes," "that's
right," "umhum," and so on at appropriate times as Dr. Hensen
shared his thinking. At times I did not clearly understand
what he was discussing. Thus, I asked questions to help
clarify particular points. Other times I shared my thoughts
about a particular topic he was discussing, sometimes
spontaneously and sometimes when he solicited my response.

There were times, too, when I shared personal classroom
teaching experiences to highlight the significance of a
task he was designing. I did not always see the full
development of a task. Dr. Hensen put final touches on
some tasks after our planning session and later shared the
completed task design with me. Then there were times we
just shared interesting information with each other.

Each planning session contained discussions of a
particular task or set of tasks to be completed in class
as well as related field assignments. The tasks he developed
and discussed within the selected sessions for analysis included: a task on fluency, an oral reading analysis task, a vocabulary task, a task on narrative and expository text questions, and a portfolio task.

Dr. Hensen used the course text as a major source for developing tasks, but I also observed that he used a variety of other materials such as audio cassettes, selected articles, and work that the students brought in from their field experiences.

**Class Meetings**

Dr. Hensen conducted the undergraduate reading assessment classes on Mondays from 12:00 to 3:00 p.m. Twenty-six students were enrolled in the class, one male and twenty-five females. These students were student teaching in a city forty miles from State University (a pseudonym for the university where Dr. Hensen is professor). In order to provide optimal use of time for the students, the classes were held at Mayfield Community College (a pseudonym) near the schools where the students were conducting their field experiences. Dr. Hensen drove from the university to the community college each Monday to teach the class.

The classes convened weekly on the second floor of Brown Hall at the community college. Brown Hall is one of the older buildings on campus. It houses many classrooms where social science courses are taught. Dr. Hensen's class did not meet in the same room every week. Instead, the class
moved between two rooms to accommodate the schedule of the community college courses. Thus, after about an hour of instruction, Dr. Hensen and the students often moved to another room. The move took place at convenient times and did not seem disruptive to Dr. Hensen or the students. Occasionally, Dr. Hensen and the students remained in the room where class convened because the course that met there an hour later had been cancelled.

I attended eight of eleven classes during the semester. All but one of those were held at Mayfield Community College. The exception was held at State University on the evening of January 28 at 6:00 p.m. This change was made because the students were participating in on campus interviews at the university with various school systems during the week of January 28. The students were not required to be in their schools for student teaching that week. Therefore it was more convenient for Dr. Hensen and the students to meet at the university.

The classrooms at the community college were set up in a traditional manner. All desks were arranged in straight rows facing the front. Sometimes Dr. Hensen used this set up for lecturing or large group discussions. However, it usually was not long until Dr. Hensen and the students transformed the room into new configurations. The desks were moved into pairs, groups, or circles which allowed the students to work collaboratively on the tasks that Dr.
Hensen had designed. Most of the tasks focused on the students' work in the field. The students used their own materials and classroom experiences to discuss and solve teaching problems presented in the tasks.

Dr. Hensen consistently provided the students with a handout of the task(s) to be performed. He also provided me with a copy of the handouts. Dr. Hensen systematically stated what the students were to do and accomplish during the class sessions. He typically explained a task to the students before they started working on the task. If the students did not understand the directions or had questions, he provided another explanation or a clarification. Once the students began a task, Dr. Hensen assisted their progress as they worked by going from group to group and talking with them about what they were doing. When a point needed clarification or an idea of interest surfaced, Dr. Hensen would bring information to the attention of the entire class, sharing the questions and ideas at the time they occurred. Students used a variety of approaches in class to accomplish a task. Sometimes the tasks were carried out by means of student to student interactions in small groups, sometimes by teacher to student interactions in a large group, and sometimes by students individually interacting with written text.

The tone in which Dr. Hensen presented ideas for teaching students was more suggestive than dogmatic. He
often made comments like: "you might want to," "there are other activities you could use," "the decision is yours," and "you have a great deal of latitude in you interpretations due to the ambiguity of the task." He also told the students that the purpose of the tasks was to get them started on their thinking. He told them there was plenty of room for their interpretations, in fact he often encouraged their interpretations.

Sometimes Dr. Hensen participated in the class tasks that he asked students to do. The fluency task is exemplary. Part of the fluency task required the students to analyze a child's oral reading. Most of the time during that task Dr. Hensen worked on the task as the students worked on it. However, he did not participate in every step of the task analysis. He explained:

I didn't in the last one [last passage analysis], and I felt less armed. ... I was looking for their field assignment. I was less armed ... to lead the discussion. I didn't know as much about it as they did, that last one.

Later, I asked Dr. Hensen if he always worked on the task that the students were doing at the time they were doing it. He replied, that sometimes he does and sometimes he does not.

Debriefing Conversations

Dr. Hensen and I met in the classroom for a debriefing
session immediately following each class meeting. The February 4th meeting was an exception. That particular debriefing was conducted at the next planning session because Dr. Hensen had to meet with some students following the February 4th class. The debriefing sessions ranged in length from six minutes to forty minutes with a computed average of 21.86 minutes (See Appendix A).

Dr. Hensen did most of the talking during the debriefing sessions as the purpose was to capture his thinking about what had transpired. He reflected on the class proceedings, discussed how the classroom experiences related to his planning, and commented about how the students responded to the tasks.

Similar to the planning sessions, I supported the conversation by responding with comments like; "yes", "umhum", "hum, that's interesting", and so on. From time to time I elaborated on ideas he was developing by sharing my thoughts and experiences. Sometimes I just listened, so I would not interrupt his train of thought.

**Chronological Descriptions of Planning Sessions, Class Meetings, and Debriefings**

The next section of this chapter contains the chronological descriptions of the sequences selected for this study. Each sequence contains a description of the planning session, the class meeting, and the debriefing session. Interpretations will follow the descriptions.
Planning Session 1

7:00 - 7:15 a.m., Beginning the Session

The first planning session in which Dr. Hensen and I participated convened on Saturday morning, January 12, 1991 at 7:00 a.m. We started the session by greeting each other as we got out of our cars at The Pines parking lot. We walked to the building together carrying our materials and talking about our trip in. Dr. Hensen carried some books and papers. I carried a knapsack which contained a notepad, some pens, and several blank cassette tapes. Additionally I toted a "jambox" which I used throughout the study to record our conversations. When we arrived at the door, Dr. Hensen searched briefly for the door key, and then unlocked the door as I held the screen door open. We both entered and walked immediately to the room on our right. We placed our materials on the large rectangular table, Dr. Hensen on one side of the table and I on the other. I then placed a chair near an electrical outlet to set the tape recorder on. I plugged the tape recorder in and put a blank cassette in the recorder, ready to begin the recording of our session. In the meantime, Dr. Hensen sorted his books and papers.

Prior to beginning the think alouds and taping, Dr. Hensen and I went to the nearby 7-Eleven to get a cup of coffee. We talked casually as we walked there and back. When we returned to The Pines I immediately started the
tape recorder and Dr. Hensen began his think aloud. The session lasted two hours and four minutes. It was an important session because it brought me up to date on what had already taken place in the course and it set the tone for the planning sessions that followed.

7:15 - 7:18 a.m., Possibilities for this Study

Dr. Hensen started this session by talking about several directions this dissertation study could take. He raised several possibilities: 1) the study could focus on what he was talking about in our planning and debriefing sessions instead of what was happening in the classes; 2) it could focus on information he derived from reflections on his classes and how he used that information in his planning; or 3) the study could focus on what was discussed in the planning sessions and how that was carried out in the class meetings. Even though Dr. Hensen talked only briefly about these ideas, the conversation reinforced my thinking on the direction of the study.

7:18 - 7:22 a.m., Dr. Hensen's Thinking about Planning

Next, Dr. Hensen talked about some things he had been thinking about relative to his assessment course. In particular he informed me that he has given much attention to the importance of planning and reflection for teachers. He was examining ways teachers could share their planning and reflection that would be useful to them. He noted that collaborative planning within a collegial relationship such
as ours was one way this could be done and that such a process might also be useful to public school teachers. According to Dr. Hensen, such interactions provide opportunities for teachers to think together out loud and become more informed about their students, the curriculum, and subtle aspects of teaching. He elaborated that such planning involves more than just planning one's lesson. It involves having a colleague sit in while you think and talk about a topic, which in turn forces you to think about issues you otherwise would not focus on. For example, Dr. Hensen noted that the setting in which we were working was forcing him to articulate and interact in ways that he would not do if he were by himself. He said he would not be at The Pines on a Saturday morning planning for his course. Instead, he explained that he would probably procrastinate and end up planning on Sunday or Monday with "patches of his planning here and there." He went on to say that sometimes he has a good block of time for planning and puts in as much as three hours. However, much of that time was usually used to do "pragmatic" things such as copying materials for class and deciding on what he wanted to use. He said our interactions would help him "get at the real substantive thinking" of his planning and that my presence would have a big influence on that no matter how far I decided to participate in the process of his planning.

7:22 - 7:25 a.m., My Reflections on a Previous Conversation
Dr. Hensen invited me to share anything I needed or wanted to talk about. I shared that I had been thinking a great deal about this study. In particular, I was considering a focus on his planning and how he developed "tasks" for students.

7:25 - 7:31 a.m., Updating Me on the Course

Dr. Hensen began brought me up to date on the assessment course by sharing what he and the students had done prior to Winter Break. First, he gave me a copy of the syllabus and a copy of a case study assignment that the students were working on (Appendices C and D respectively). We discussed the due date of the case study briefly. According to the syllabus, the case study assignment was due on January 8th. However, most students had not completed their case studies. Dr. Hensen told me he originally planned to have the case studies due before the students left for Winter vacation, but "that couldn't happen." Therefore, he extended the due date till the first of the month, but then realized that it was not good to have them due the first day after vacation. So, the case studies would be coming in soon. The following conversation illustrates our interaction on this matter.

Hensen - Here's a copy of a case study I asked them to do.

Lucado - This is what they've done up to this point, right?
Hensen - Umhum, yeh, that's the task they did.
Lucado - Okay. This is what was due January 8th?
Hensen - Well, no, it's still out.
Lucado - Oh, it's still out.
Hensen - It will come in Monday. Yeh, it was due January 8th.
Lucado - Okay.
Hensen - I wanted it before they left, and that couldn't happen. So then I said, well I'll give you till the first of the month. Then I said, no that's stupid having them hand it in after the, the first day after vacation, that was dumb ....

Dr. Hensen began looking intently at his notes as he finished talking about the case studies. He then began to talk about the previous class. He reported that he had gotten "several major things" across to the students thus far. They had looked at: 1) the individual (which they were continuing to do); 2) the main features of print awareness (which included story book reading and voice pointing); 3) knowledge of print; and 4) word identification, as reflected in written language and developmental spelling. Basically these four topics related to the first three chapters of the course text, Reading Diagnosis for Teachers: An Instructional Approach (Barr, Sadow, & Blachowicz, 1990).

Dr. Hensen told me that he had also played a cassette tape of a third grade child reading which he and his students
had discussed. He said that he used the tape to model how people think about reading. He talked about the child's reading himself and asked the students some questions to keep them engaged in thinking. His major purpose in using this approach was to have students hear him thinking about a "kid's" reading. He said they focused on the issue of error in reading because students perceive error as bad.

7:31 - 7:42 a.m., Possibilities for Monday's Class

Dr. Hensen began making plans for the upcoming Monday class. He talked about a variety of possibilities centered around the topic of fluency. He started by sharing a graph that he would use in class to show students how a reader distributes his/her attention when given a reading task (See Appendix B). He explained that the graph could be used to indicate a child's use of graphic or meaning cues, illustrate that anxiety interferes with comprehension, and to show how much a student analyzes or guesses when reading.

Dr. Hensen elaborated that he wanted to go back and re-do a discussion of the tape of a child's reading so the students in the class could come to grips with the issue of overgeneralizing. He expressed concern that students might overgeneralize from what they were reading. For example, he explained they might come to believe that print is not important, that only meaning is important. However, Dr. Hensen wanted the students to realize that print is important, that reading is interactive, and that reading
requires the reader's attention.

Dr. Hensen informed me that the students should have read through chapter 4 in the required course text. They were essentially working on this chapter. Dr. Hensen said he would not really talk about the chapter much, but would extend the students' reading by using an "easy" form that divides what is important in a child's oral reading into four chunks. Those chunks included: (1) difficulty level, which he said they had already talked about, (2) word learning level which encompasses a fund of sight words, (3) the use of cue systems in identifying other words, and (4) integration fluency (how fast is the student reading and "what is going on there?") Dr. Hensen said that he had looked at this form in the past as a diagnostician, but had not shared it with students.

Dr. Hensen reported that he would continue using the tape of a "kid's" reading in class on Monday. He explained that up to this point he had modeled and interpreted his thinking about the reader's reading in front of the students. He elaborated that in Monday's class the students would have a chance to "operate on the tape" for about an hour or so, following a "little lecturette." This would provide the students with an opportunity to analyze a third grader's reading of several graded passages, i.e. third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade reading passages. Dr. Hensen explained that the students would see a rather fluent reader
gradually made into a poor reader. The reader on the tape has the word recognition ability and the technical ability to move on into higher grade passages such as the fifth and sixth grade passages. However, Dr. Hensen pointed out that the reader begins to run low on background knowledge when he gets to the fifth grade social studies passage. He explained that he would use the tape to guide the students toward making some new decisions about what error rate means and why understanding error rate is important for teachers.

7:42 - 8:09 a.m., Developing a Framework for Assessment

Dr. Hensen returned his attention to the course textbook (Barr, Sadow, & Blachowicz, 1990) as he began developing a framework for assessing vocabulary development. He explained that the text was new to him and that he had not read the material. Therefore, we would look at it together. He talked out loud as he skimmed chapter 5 on vocabulary and pointed out that the authors generally start the chapters with a theoretical discussion. I did not have a copy of the text, so I listened intently as he elaborated. Dr. Hensen noted that chapter 5 contained information about multiple meanings, metaphor, and difficulty in understanding figurative language. He stated that he had never dealt with these issues the way this text presented them.

As he continued skimming the chapter, he said a framework was emerging for developing vocabulary. He said the framework included:
(1) Assessment of prior knowledge
(2) Active discussion
(3) Application of concepts
(4) Use in practice
(5) Diagnostic procedures

He remarked that he might use the vocabulary in this chapter to construct a vocabulary test for the students on concepts related to reading.

According to Dr. Hensen, the course text was "heavily packed" and was not easy reading for students. The gray pages were the ones that interested him the most. I asked him if the gray pages contained pragmatic situations (practical ideas for solving classroom issues) that his students might emulate. He responded saying, "Yes, that is exactly what it is." The text also contained information about instructional techniques. However, Dr. Hensen said he does not place as much emphasis on instructional techniques in this course because they are covered in other courses the students take, such as the language arts course. He said he might go back and highlight some of the vocabulary, but as far as the instructional techniques were concerned, he would only be going back to "touch bases" and "fill in holes." Dr. Hensen mentioned that he would read the chapter on vocabulary before Monday's class and make some decisions about what he would do.

Dr. Hensen reiterated that he was looking for a
"strategy framework" for the process of assessment. One framework that he said is "always floating around in his head" consisted of the following questions:

1) What am I looking at?
2) How might I do that?
3) What will I do with that information?
4) Why look?
5) What does it mean?
6) How does it impact instruction?

Dr. Hensen said he wanted the students to create an overall framework for assessment. He reasoned that the students were finding out interesting things about children and tasks, but they did not have a framework for what they were discovering. According to Dr. Hensen, it is important for students to develop an assessment framework because teachers generally limit assessments to information about the impact of lessons on students which can lead to an inaccurate picture of a child's progress. He articulated that students lack of having an assessment framework was something that has been missing in his work with this class so far. He said he had spent more time on "how you look" and less on "what kids can do." Dr. Hensen went on to say that he did not think that anybody else (referring to his colleagues) had a framework that students could use to examine what they were learning about children and "tasks." He said he does not see a clear connection between
what a lot of people do to find out what children can do, and what actually happens in their class. According to Dr. Hensen, teachers and diagnosticians do not take the task in its "fullest, authentic form." They just look at the cognitive components, often overlooking the social and affective components.

Dr. Hensen repeated the questions that make up his assessment framework and explained that, during the next class meeting, he would help the students develop a framework for assessment. He would talk about it a bit and perhaps outline the framework on a big piece of paper. This would be a new piece to the course because he had not done it before.

8:09 - 8:10 a.m., A Possible Field Assignment

Dr. Hensen briefly shifted our discussion to developing a field assignment for the next class. According to him, field assignments are tasks that students work on outside of class using classroom situations where they are student teaching to explore the concepts they have discussed in class. While developing this field assignment, Dr. Hensen said:

I want to get them looking at something in their classroom once again, but I don't know whether it will be something related to vocabulary, which it very well may be, or it may be related to, tasks in general, because there's where I'm headed next. I want to begin
to introduce the notion of tasks to them.

8:10 - 8:11 a.m., Notion of Tasks

Dr. Hensen said that he generally introduces the notion of task by having students participate in a task of some type. Then he asks them to look at the components of the task just completed. However, he pointed out that this process takes considerable time to complete. He questioned whether or not he would have time to present the notion of tasks to his students in this manner. He wanted enough time to do the reading tape activity and present some vocabulary issues.

8:11 - 8:12 a.m., Model Matters

Dr. Hensen said he never knows what kind of problems might come up related to the model. Since he was their model leader, he was responsible for keeping the students informed about issues related to their program of study. The students might have questions or concerns about their program that needed to be addressed. Such matters could be taken care of at the beginning of class, both a convenience and a problem for Dr. Hensen. It was convenient because he had all of his students together, but a problem when he had another agenda. Sometimes taking care of model matters took a good amount of class time. Dr. Hensen said he usually got in about two good hours of instruction where his students were "paying attention and feeling good."

8:12 - 8:16 a.m., Self Assessment
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Reflecting on his conversations, Dr. Hensen stated that he was feeling better about the possibilities for linking the material in the assessment text with what he has done in the past. He pointed out that the course text had some interesting ideas relative to assessment. One of the ideas had to do with the notion of reciprocity in which the teacher and student collaborate in assessment. He said that is an important idea, but he was not sure where it fits into his course yet. He said he had only exposed his students to this idea in bits and pieces, yet he wanted to consider the notion of self assessment more. After all, according to Dr. Hensen, the whole notion of assessment is to promote growth in children. I commented that I thought collaborative assessment was an interesting idea because most of the time assessment is so one sided.

Dr. Hensen shared that he used to incorporate self assessment into his course. He had students write about their thoughts as they performed a particular task, or at the completion of the task, but said he has gotten away from that. He stated that he might go back to it though because a "task reaction sheet is a good thing to do." He supported this idea with a statement about reaction sheets:

I have noticed that sometimes when I use it with students they will begin to use it with their own students because they get informed.
I supported Dr. Hensen's statement by sharing one of my experiences. I explained that when you provide students with an opportunity to elaborate on their work, you gain more insight about their response that you otherwise might not have. For example, in a question answer situation, a student may have given what you consider to be an incorrect response. However, if the student is allowed to tell you more about his/her thinking, you begin to see that the student made a legitimate response. You find yourself saying, "Oh, yes, I understand what you are saying."

8:16 – 8:20 a.m., Getting Students to Read the Text and Grading

Dr. Hensen began reflecting on ways to get students to read the course text. He also brought up the issue of grading. He talked about these issues relative to the previous course he taught this same group of students. He said he gave a couple of multiple choice tests, something that he had not done for a long time, related to the text they were using in the course (Duffy & Roehler, 1989). After the first test, he noted that the students read the text more thoroughly. Dr. Hensen said the students might have even gone too far in their reading by looking for every little detail. Nevertheless, he pointed out, "they read more of the information than they ever have before, I know it." He explained that in order to get his students to read the text his evaluation system must indicate the importance
of reading the text or the students will not do it.

Next, Dr. Hensen shared a strategy he used with the students when they took the multiple choice test. He explained that he gave the test back to the students and told them that if he had marked an item wrong and they felt it was right, they could write an explanation of why they thought the question was right. He elaborated that some students took him up on the offer and therefore received credit for their efforts. Dr. Hensen said he liked that approach and was going to keep it. However, he noted that he was not using a test for this assessment course because the course text was not the kind of book that called for such evaluation.

8:20 – 8:32 a.m., Tape Malfunction

Interestingly, when I played the tapes back for transcription, I discovered that shortly after an hour of recording, I had lost about six minutes of our talk due to a defect in the tape. I recall that prior to the defective part of the tape, Dr. Hensen was reading some selections from Improving Classroom Reading Instruction: A Decision Making Approach (Duffy & Roehler, 1989) to point out how Gerry Duffy defined a task and the reward system he attached to a task.

8:32 – 8:36 a.m., Options for Monday's Class

Dr. Hensen returned his attention to considering several options for the upcoming Monday class. He said he might
do a demonstration by taking his students through a task. Then he debated as to whether he would give them a model or let them "mess and explore" first. He said he usually opted for the messing and exploring first because models bother him. He said models block (thinking), particularly with a "fuzzy" concept.

Another option was that he could possibly use the language arts projects his students had done previously for an activity on analyzing a child's work. Through the activity, the students would go back and get a better understanding of their projects since "they only understood them at a certain level." A potential problem with this idea was that some of the students might have returned the children's work. To circumvent this problem, he decided he could have the students pair up and work on the same materials, that is if enough students had kept samples of children's work.

He also discussed having students do a field assignment which would require them to bring something back to class that occurred in their classroom. One problem he anticipated was that the students were not heavily involved in the classroom yet. They were not doing much teaching or interacting with children since they had not been in the field long. The students were still getting to know their classroom, so much of their time was spent observing instead of interacting at that time.
Next, Dr. Hensen talked about grading. He said that grading ought to reflect the critical features of a given task. In other words, the goals and specific objectives of a task should be connected in some way to the criteria for grading. To illustrate, Dr. Hensen read aloud a selection where a teacher had developed criteria for a personal narrative that her second grade students were assigned to write. He pointed out that this particular teacher had aligned her evaluation system with her task system. For example, she established that her students' narratives would contain complete sentences, correct use of capitalization, correct spelling, and an illustration. The final draft narratives would then be assessed relative to whether or not they contained these criteria. Dr. Hensen remarked that the process of aligning the evaluation system with a task is hard for beginners.

Using the idea from the selection he just read, Dr. Hensen said he could have the students (possibly working together) create a lesson on writing a narrative. He speculated that he could start out by giving the students some goal. For example, a goal could simply be, "I want kids to do this," whatever. The students would then "generate the critical features and the sequences they must follow to obtain that goal, and then [consider] the features of [the] task environment . . . ." He noted that the
students would end up with a lesson plan, plus they would have to consider all of the things that went into the planning of that lesson. As a result, the students would have established criteria for a task which they could reflect upon. Dr. Hensen stated that he had not before started a task by providing students with the goal, but that doing so could be a "good precursor to their journey in the classroom."

I told Dr. Hensen that at times I still found it difficult to come up with criteria for a particular task, even with my experience. He responded, "Isn't it though, I mean my own tasks ...." He said it was sometimes difficult for him to establish criteria for the tasks he develops. To illustrate, he shared the criteria he had established for the case study task (Appendix D). One of the criteria was to look for a "linkage of observations and judgments." He pointed out that this criteria, as well as each criteria for the case study task, could still be examined in more depth. He said you have to make decisions as to how global you want to be. He went on to say that it would be fairer to students if he provided them with operational definitions of his criteria.

This led us to the topic of holistic judgment. Dr. Hensen said that making holistic judgments is something you must feel comfortable with as a teacher. He explained that he had read lots of case studies, so he had no problem
saying, "this is an A case study in my judgment." He said, "For a summative grade, that is defensible."

I told Dr. Hensen that the kinds of tasks he was developing seemed to me to be very important for beginning teachers. I explained that such tasks help students explore some of the issues that teachers are facing in classrooms today. Additionally, he was providing the students with time to mull over ideas and experiment with ideas prior to having full responsibilities of a teacher. At the same time the students could get feedback from him.

8:48 - 8:58 a.m., Sketch of Monday's Class

Near the end of our planning session, Dr. Hensen began to summarize and organize his proposals for class into a time sequence. He said that he always starts class off with "model stuff," the business things that have to be taken care of. Following the model business, he said he would move into the first phase of his lesson which would include an explanation on fluency. Within this explanation he would again talk about the notion of error rate with the students. However, he would only talk a little bit because he wanted his students to figure out some things for themselves (notions about error, the idea of speed, and automaticity versus integration). Next, he said he would move to an activity that would require the students to listen to a tape of a third grade child reading and then analyze the reading. He said the students would work in
groups of two or three because he wanted some interaction and discussion among students. The activity would require the students to fill out a data form, write a summary of the information gained by using the form, and share their summaries with another group in the class. Dr. Hensen noted that this activity would take a while to accomplish, but said it would be worth the time because of the foundation it would lay. He said the activity should bring together notions about oral reading ability because the students would be talking about word knowledge, fluency, integration of information from cue sources, and error in reading. According to Dr. Hensen, the purpose of the activity was for the students to gain an internalized sense of what children's oral reading is telling them. During the process they would establish some criteria for analyzing oral reading. Dr. Hensen reiterated some of his plans for Monday, talked about making copies of the materials he would need for class (emphasizing a concern for conserving paper), and at 8:58 took a short break.

8:58 - 9:05 a.m., Long Range Calendar Plan

When he returned, Dr. Hensen got a calendar to record the dates of the weeks left in the semester. On a piece of white typing paper he listed the dates and jotted down a tentative outline of the topics he would cover in the course on those dates (Appendix E). He stated that he did not know how complex the tasks would be, so he was not sure
of the time needed for each task. I asked him if the progression of one class period determined the direction of the next. He gave an affirmative response, "So much of what I know and understand is mediated by them [his students] and how they come to grips with this [the tasks]."

9:05 - 9:21 a.m., Developing a Portfolio Task

In the last part of our planning session Dr. Hensen talked about the idea of having his students develop a portfolio as one of their graded tasks. He explained that once the students understood individual tasks, they could begin to think about a profile task. A portfolio task would include developing a profile of a child's reading and writing for a specified amount of time. The students would begin building a picture of a child in their classroom with a focus on literacy development. As a guide for developing a portfolio, Dr. Hensen would supply the students with the following questions: 1) What would you include? 2) What would it mean? and 3) Why keep all of that?

Dr. Hensen then asked me, as a fifth grade teacher, what would I want to know about a child's reading and writing? What kind of things would I begin to assemble in a portfolio for a fifth grader? In response I shared a unit I had developed in science for fifth graders on the systems of the body. I explained that my major goals for that unit were to accommodate different modalities of learning, to provide more opportunities for cooperative
learning, and to get my students actively involved in "hands on" learning. I am not sure I answered his question about reading and writing, but I shared some of the assignments that students did during the unit which I would consider placing in a portfolio. Items I would include are experiment write ups, listening activity sheets, comprehension quizzes, and self evaluations. Dr. Hensen listened as I shared my ideas, then responded, "Let me ask you this question, because I have a number of people who are in content areas like that." He asked me if students teaching in content areas would have opportunities to develop portfolios for their children that would be reflective of a child's use of different kinds of reading and writing. I assured him that this could be done because reading, writing, listening, and vocabulary development are such integral parts of assignments that are done in content areas.

9:21 - 9:27 a.m., Ending the Planning Session

Dr. Hensen closed the planning session by summarizing the course and what he wanted his students to do, reiterating the points he had presented throughout the planning session.

We gathered our materials in preparation for our departure. Once we had everything ready to go, Dr. Hensen and I went to the copy machine in the back office. He made me a copy of chapter 4 and chapter 5 of the course text and the notes he had sketched in his notebook during the session (Appendix B).
Class Meeting 1

The first class meeting I attended convened on January 14, 1991 for two hours and forty-seven minutes. Twenty-six students attended the class, one male and twenty-five females.

12:00 - 12:06 p.m., Class Begins

The class started at 12:00 p.m. in room 210 at Mayfield Community College. Dr. Hensen was in the front of the classroom behind a long, rectangular, stationary desk sorting some materials in preparation for class. As he sorted the materials the students entered the classroom, casually talking with each other as they walked to their desks. Gradually they took their seats which were arranged in typical straight rows facing the front of the room. The lights were off and the room was rather warm.

After sorting the handouts onto the teacher desk at the front of the room, Dr. Hensen asked his students to come to the front of the room to pick up a copy of each handout: a memo describing student evaluation for the spring semester; a parking permission slip; two lesson feedback forms; and a student teaching evaluation checklist. It took the students about five minutes to pick up the memos and get settled again. Dr. Hensen explained each handout and answered students' questions. Much of the information on the handouts concerned what Dr. Hensen referred to as "model matters," the business kinds of things that either
he or his students wanted to address related to the students' student teaching experience.

12:06 - 12:29 p.m., Model Matters

Dr. Hensen, using a lecture format, first discussed the evaluation memo with the students. According to Dr. Hensen, the purpose of the memo was to provide the students with information about their spring semester as he saw it unfolding. He highlighted four stages they should experience: 1) an orientation stage, where they would learn the routines of the classroom and become familiar with their students. The major emphasis during this stage would be to observe their cooperating teachers and the children as they interact in the classroom; 2) a "shared responsibility stage," where the cooperating teacher and student teacher would team as much as possible; 3) the "major responsibility stage," where they may assume total control of the classroom for a period of time; and 4) the "winding down stage," where they would begin thinking less about school and more about "big dates" such as graduation, marriages, and getting hired.

In closing the discussion of the memo, Dr. Hensen emphasized the importance of completing professional responsibilities during the winding down stage. He encouraged the students to return any borrowed materials and complete the grading of any papers they had started. He mentioned to the students that, "the supervising teacher should not be left hanging."

Next, Dr. Hensen discussed the evaluation process that
the students would undergo during the semester. The students were student teaching in the mornings at the elementary schools and attending their classes at Mayfield in the afternoon. This changed about half way through the semester. When they reached the half way point, the students would have completed their course work and would spend the remainder of the semester in the schools for the entire day. Dr. Hensen explained to his students that at the end of their half day experience they should have a conference with their supervising teachers. At the conference they would use an anecdotal evaluation form to get an idea of their performance up to the beginning of March. Later in the semester, the student teacher, the supervising teacher, and the university supervisor would each fill out the standard university checklist form which would be used for the final evaluation. The students did not receive the checklist forms that Dr. Hensen referred to during class, but he informed them that their grades would be determined by the input from each of the checklist evaluations and that a major emphasis would be placed on their growth throughout the semester.

Dr. Hensen proceeded to the next model matter by asking the students whether or not they wanted to have a session on job interviewing. He informed them that such a session would be optional and would take place following one of the classes. The students decided they wanted a session
on job interviewing and set the date for Monday, January 21, 1991. I might add here that job interviews were on the students' minds because representatives of local school systems would soon visit the university to interview students who were interested in entering the teaching profession. In fact, several questions were asked by the students relative to those upcoming interviews. In particular, students expressed concern about finding time to schedule their interviews at the university placement office. This was a concern because they were in the schools and attending classes during the placement office hours. Dr. Hensen told the students they would have to make arrangements with their cooperating teachers for time to schedule their interviews. The students also asked questions about how the interviews would be set up. They wanted to know things like: would all the interviews take place in the same room, would there be one interviewer for each school, and in how many interviews should they participate. Several students shared information they had received from the placement office and friends about the interviews.

Dr. Hensen then informed the students that he had their language arts projects in his car and would bring them in during the break for them to pick up. Also, in response to a request of some of the students, he explained which field assignments were optional and which ones were required. The discussion about the optional field assignments was
somewhat confusing to me at this point. However, the students seemed to understand when Dr. Hensen explained:

I am going to designate which one is the optional. I didn't tell you that up front because these next couple are real critical. If somebody says I can't do that one, ... I'll be open for a negotiation process. There's one that I'm planning that is more optional than others.

12:29 - 12:51 p.m., Creating an Assessment Framework

Before starting a discussion on "creating an assessment framework," Dr. Hensen introduced me to the class. He told the students that I was interested in how teachers learn to become diagnosticians and how diagnosticians incorporate such learning into their classrooms.

Dr. Hensen lead a large group discussion on developing an assessment framework. As he talked, he sketched an outline of the framework on the chalkboard. He began by saying:

I fear that there's a lot of randomness that goes on in assessment in classrooms. So the first question is why have an assessment framework at all."

He went on to inform the students that there were two levels on which they should focus, one, an overall plan, and two, a specific plan. He said this would become clearer as he developed the characteristics of the assessment framework. Dr. Hensen periodically brought the students into the
discussion by asking them questions related to their experiences in the field. For example, he guided their thinking by asking:

Now, in an elementary classroom, what are the major things in a third grade that you are looking for? ... what's on a report card?

One student said there is a place to address students' behavior on a report card. Another responded that report cards contain places to assign a grade for each of the subject areas, i.e. reading, math, English, spelling, science, health, and social studies. Building on the students' comments, Dr. Hensen highlighted that report cards contain both academic and non-academic issues. He said that the subject areas are what schools have decided are the major pieces of curriculum, the "major big chunks." They are the things that teachers have to look at to provide evaluation for students, parents, the school, and the teacher. However, he also informed his students that this sort of evaluation is only at one level, "a kind of quantitative assessment, how much did you learn or how much do you know."

The discussion lasted for about twenty-one minutes. Dr. Hensen quickly outlined the assessment model on the chalkboard as they discussed the assessment framework because another class was scheduled to meet in the room at 1:00 p.m. The assessment framework, as outlined on the board, consisted of the following:
Overall plan

What am I assessing?
Specific plan

What am I looking for?
How do I do that?
What does it mean?

What influence does that have on my instruction?

12:51 - 12:59 p.m., Break and Return

The model matters and the development of the assessment framework were conducted in a lecture format. The students were in rows facing the front of the room.

Dr. Hensen and the students took a break, beginning at 12:51 p.m. Restrooms, drink machines, and snack machines were down on the next floor level. The class reassembled in room 207 at 12:56 p.m. with drinks and snacks. The students picked up their language arts projects, and Dr. Hensen briefly explained where they were to park at Mayfield. He also told them that classes would meet during interview week.

Room 207 was not as hot as the previous room, the lights had been turned on, and the blinds were closed. Dr. Hensen was at the front of the room behind a movable desk with a lectern on it. Again the students were in rows facing Dr. Hensen.

12:59 - 1:25 p.m., Discussion on Fluency

Dr. Hensen began another large group discussion, this
time on the issue of fluency. He began by asking his students:

What does the concept of fluency connote or denote to you? When you talk about fluency in reading, what comes to your mind?

A rather lengthy discussion followed. As the students expressed their ideas, Dr. Hensen wrote them on the chalkboard and talked about each. Additionally, he highlighted ideas about fluency using a graph that he drew on the chalkboard. He used the graph to point out how children use graphic information and meaning information when reading. Dr. Hensen drew the fluency discussion to a close by emphasizing that the approach a teacher should take when correcting a miscue or error "depends on what the intention for the lesson is." He stated that determining a reading error is part of the teacher's decision making process. The teacher must consider the setting and "play all the variables." He said, "Common sense takes over."

1:25 - 2:47 p.m., Examining Fluency

Following the discussion on fluency, Dr. Hensen asked the students to take out the assessment form and a copy of the two reading passages (Appendix F) that he passed out last week. He explained that they would use the form to examine a reader's fluency by listening to a taped recording of a third grade reader as he read several passages. Dr. Hensen discussed the form with the class
and highlighted the points they should focus on as they listened to the reader on the tape. The points of focus included: reading difficulty, word learning, and speed of reading. Dr. Hensen directed the students to listen to the tape of the reader reading and to take notes as they listened. They could take notes alone or with a partner.

Dr. Hensen began playing the tape. At first, he had some difficulty finding the exact passage he wanted, but he soon located the passage. The students made notes as the recorder played. Then for about thirteen minutes, mostly in pairs, the students analyzed the child's reading using the oral reading analysis form (Appendix G) that Dr. Hensen had provided earlier in class.

Dr. Hensen then led a discussion that focused on what he and his students had observed. The discussion lead to a conclusion that anxiety affects a child's performance in reading. Dr. Hensen referred the students back to the graph he had drawn on the chalkboard earlier. He added anxiety to the graph as part of what takes up a reader's "space." The graph now included anxiety, graphic clues, and meaning as things that occupy a reader's space.

Two other issues were included in the discussion as Dr. Hensen and his students talked about their observations, the rate at which a child reads and his/her comprehension. Dr. Hensen cautioned the students to use reading rates as a "temperature check" and to keep in mind that a child's
speed in reading could be a reflection of a variety of factors.

Based on their observations and discussions thus far, Dr. Hensen asked the students to predict how well they thought the reader on the tape would do with some comprehension questions he was asked following the reading of the story. The students made some oral predictions. They did not have a copy of the questions to follow, so Dr. Hensen asked them to "just listen and see how the kid did with the questions." Dr. Hensen then played the tape of the reader answering some questions about the passage he just read. Intermittently, Dr. Hensen stopped the tape and explained how the child was doing.

The pattern of listening, observing, discussing, predicting, and checking comprehension was followed for the next reading selection as Dr. Hensen and the students analyzed a fourth grade level passage. For about three minutes the students analyzed this fourth grade passage which was read by the same third grader. Then they discussed their observations. This time the students focused more on comprehension. Dr. Hensen and the students analyzed the same third grader reading progressively more difficult passages. Dr. Hensen pointed out to the students that they should be observing a reader being made into a poor reader because as the child moves through the grade level materials, he has less and less background knowledge to deal with the
readings.

Dr. Hensen changed the task somewhat for the fifth grade level passage. He asked the students to view the reader as a fifth grader reading a fifth grade passage, even though it was the same third grade reader reading the passage. Prior to playing the fifth grade passage, Dr. Hensen explained the Classroom Reading Miscue Assessment (CRMA) sheet that was handed out earlier (Appendix H). This sheet was used to analyze the fifth grade passage. However, only parts I and II of the CRMA form were used to analyze the reading because time was limited.

Dr. Hensen ended class by assigning field assignment number 4 (Appendix I). He distributed a typed copy of the field assignment to the students and asked them to do the best they could with it over the next week. He recommended that they not worry about number 1 (semantic acceptability) on the CRMA form because they did not discuss that in class. He directed them to just do the classroom analysis on some child during the week. The students started gathering their books. Dr. Hensen asked them to place any case studies they had to turn in on the desk at the front of the room in one pile. Students began dispersing, some talking with Dr. Hensen on the way out.

2:47- 2:51 p.m., Meeting with Two Students

Immediately following the class Dr. Hensen met with two students. They talked some more about interviewing
and a personal matter related to their work in the field.

**Debriefing 1**

2:51 - 2:52 p.m., Beginning the Debriefing Session

Dr. Hensen explained, "I am pooped!". I told him that I certainly understood. Three hours was a long time to keep students engaged, particularly after student teaching all morning. He said he wanted to work in everything that he covered in the class and it "almost hurt them" (the students). Nevertheless, he provided the students with an assessment framework they could use throughout the course.

2:52 - 2:57 p.m., How Much Students Can Do

Dr. Hensen indicated that he always had a problem with determining how much to have his students do. He expressed a concern about how much of the course content his students were internalizing and how much of what he did made sense to them. For example, reflecting on the field assignment which required the use of the classroom inventory, he said:

I think it may end up confusing them. I probably should have sent them forth with some kind of micro analysis of a kid's reading, not a holistic judgment task.

According to Dr. Hensen, he sometimes does the reasoning of a particular task for the students. For instance, during the fluency task he said he re-assumed control because "there seemed to be something missing to let the students go ahead and work in groups." He explained that the task was more difficult than he thought it would be, therefore he would
try to rectify that situation in some way for future classes. He elaborated that he could revise the task by combining the "Classroom Reading Miscue Assessment" and the "Oral Reading Analysis" sheets into one new sheet. He would convert these tasks to questions like he did for the assessment framework. He reasoned that frameworks for him are a set of critical questions. He concluded:

So I think that's what I have to do, go back to the drawing board, and myself create those critical questions [that] I think they ought to ask.

I responded by sharing that when I was an undergraduate I found the miscue analysis framework that I was exposed to very helpful as I began my teaching career. I told him that as I sat in the classroom and observed what was taking place, I pondered how important it was that students were being exposed to an assessment framework. Having been in the classroom recently, I felt that the framework and issues the students were discussing would be very important and relevant as they begin their teaching. Dr. Hensen responded:

See, there's the rub, Charles. I want it to be meaningful now, but I also want something that's there for later on.

2:57 - 3:00 p.m., Reflections on the CRMA

Dr. Hensen again mentioned that he thought the CRMA form would be easy for the students to use, but instead found that it was "difficult and noisy." However, he
explained that the CRMA was an important form because it presented the students with the kinds of judgments that teachers have to make everyday. He gave the CRMA to the students so they would "mess with it and struggle with it."

3:00 – 3:03 p.m., Reflections on the Fluency Task

Dr. Hensen stated that he had never dealt with fluency the way he did in that class. He said the course text had gotten him to deal with fluency in a new way, "a kind of temperature check on lots of things that are going on."

Next, Dr. Hensen explained that he was unable to discuss the assessment framework in length with the students because he wanted to get it presented to them before they had to move from one classroom to another. Therefore, he reasoned that "the assessment framework was flat." He said:

I was just going to plow through that (developing the assessment framework) in twenty minutes and get the damn thing on the board, and make this statement (the importance of an assessment framework).

Dr. Hensen went on to say that his students came up with some "beautiful comments" about fluency during the class discussions. Also, according to Dr. Hensen, the students got the major concepts about fluency from the discussions.

In his discussion about the tape of the child's reading, Dr. Hensen said that he got excited about the way the child on the tape "makes meaning." However, he stated that he
should stick with the oral reading analysis and stay away from the comprehension questions when doing the fluency task. He said it made sense to do the oral reading analysis and comprehension questions together, the way he did in class, but he lost the discussion on fluency when he included the comprehension questions in the discussion.

3:03 - 3:05 p.m., Dr. Hensen's Involvement in the Tasks During Class

I reminded Dr. Hensen that in an earlier discussion he told me that one of his goals was to work on the tasks in class while the students work on them. I elaborated that I noticed he worked on most of the tasks during class. He informed me that sometimes he works on the tasks when the students do and sometimes he does not. He pointed out that in the class he did not work on the last task while the students did, and as a result, felt "less armed." While the students worked on the last task, Dr. Hensen looked for their field assignment handout. Thus, when it came time to discuss the task, he said he did not know as much as his students did. He explained that he was pressed for time and therefore not happy with the way the class was ending. He said he "did not know how to pull it out, so he just let it kind of fade out."

3:05 - 3:09 p.m., Plans for More Student Participation

Dr. Hensen said for the next class he would make a concerted effort to have some "interactive and participatory
activities" and that his students would be more "energized." He noted that it was difficult to maintain concentration on a task when the class often starts off with twenty minutes of model business, some confusion relative to room availability, and three or so student questions that are unrelated to the task. For example, he explained that he wanted the development of the assessment framework "to be more generative" on the students' part. However, time was limited because they had to be out of the room by 12:50 p.m. Dr. Hensen said he adjusts to such circumstances all the time, "just like any teacher." Even though the development of the assessment framework was not as generative as Dr. Hensen desired, he noted that the students put in some quality time. He stated that when the class reconvened after the break, the students "tried real hard" and were "animated" for about forty-five minutes to an hour. He was happy with that because on a whole the students "learned something about fluency and understanding reading."

3:09 - 3:12 p.m., Ending the Debriefing Session

Near the end of the debriefing session Dr. Hensen told me that our conversations together were helpful to him because they were forcing him to begin to "chunk things" and his thinking would be preserved on the tapes of our sessions.

I told Dr. Hensen that next week in our planning session I would share a copy of some interview questions I had
compiled while teaching a diagnosis and developmental reading course. The students in the course wrote down the kinds of questions they were asked in their job interviews and I compiled them into a list. I thought that these questions might be helpful to the students working with Dr. Hensen since they expressed concern about upcoming interviews. Perhaps they could get a feel for the kinds of questions they might be asked. Dr. Hensen said it would be great if I would bring a copy to our meeting on Saturday.

This debriefing closed as I described the class handouts that I needed. Dr. Hensen said he would get copies for me. We then clarified the date and time for the next class meeting which would be held at the university instead of Mayfield. We gathered our materials and left the building together, talking casually as we went to our separate cars.
Planning Session 2

8:00 - 8:16 A.M., Beginning the Session

Our second planning session began very much like our first. However, we arrived at 8:00 A.M. instead of 7:00 A.M. Again, Dr. Hensen and I walked to 7-Eleven for coffee.

When we got back at the Pines, I began talking about a vocabulary activity I had done with my college students called "Capsule Vocabulary". I thought it would be of interest to Dr. Hensen because the exact process for the activity was described in detail in the vocabulary chapter of the course text. It was an activity that I had discovered in "The Reading to Learn Summer Institute" in August of 1987. I was surprised to see it when I read the chapter. Dr. Hensen laughed and said:

Well, I guarantee you can look around anywhere and you will find it tucked away. Somewhere, somebody's got some idea ... that is at least related, but you have your own twists on them.

8:16 - 8:21 A.M., Dr. Hensen's Thinking About the Course

As we sipped our coffee, Dr. Hensen revealed that he had been doing a lot of thinking about his reading assessment course, but in order to communicate his thinking to me he said he would have to make it more explicit. As our discussion continued he described three problems. One particular problem that had been "nagging" him was how to create "authentic tasks" for students and teachers where
they actually study their own work. He reasoned:

Why should I bring my students out of their own work to come to my class to create vicarious experiences to approximate the work that they're doing in the classroom. Obviously, it's going to lose something in the transition. ... there's reason to do that sometimes, but to do it always because we're set up that way is the thing that doesn't make sense to me.

Another problem Dr. Hensen framed was how to provide "interesting experiences as well as useful ones" for his students when they come to his class. He noted that interesting experiences and useful ones are sometimes "in conflict."

The third problem he addressed was "how much of the typical reading diagnosis stuff" he should include versus how much of his "different vision" should he include. He noted that he was not quite sure what that different vision was, but that it creates a lot of ambiguity and uncertainty in his work.

Dr. Hensen commented on the influence our conversations were having on his development. He stated that he was ready and wanting to become involved in a collaborative process because he was wanting to place more emphasis on his teaching career. He said he has only "been studying small pieces" of his teaching and that the process he and I were involved in allowed him to "bring together a whole host of thoughts"
that he has had over the years. He added, that our process helped him think "in a more cohesive way ... [and it was] causing [him] to think even more extensively."

8:21 – 8:23 A.M., Goals for the Next Class

Dr. Hensen turned his attention to the development of tasks for the next class. He disclosed he wanted students to be more actively engaged in class than they were in the last class. In fact, he said he wanted "lots of action." Additionally, he wanted to combine the notion of reading performance with a classroom miscue inventory to see if there was a sensible way to get the students to look at a reader's reading. With these goals in mind, Dr. Hensen continued by developing a task on fluency and a task on vocabulary for the upcoming class.

8:23 – 9:38 A.M., Developing a Fluency Task

The first task Dr. Hensen developed during this planning session was a task on "fluency." He identified four questions that could be used as a framework for students' thinking about fluency. These included:

1) What is fluency?
2) Why might one look at fluency?
3) How might you look at fluency?
4) What would you do with the information you gained?

Sipping his coffee, Dr. Hensen "brainstormed" several options for helping students develop the fluency framework. He said he could: 1) have various groups examine the four
questions; 2) use one of the case studies in the course text to "pull it together" (to answer the questions; 3) start with a free write; 4) have the students brainstorm and do graphic organizers; 5) design a task that would involve students in creating a reading problem (although he noted that such a task could be too difficult for the students at the time); or 6) create a reading problem on fluency and have the students generate appropriate instructional decisions.

After mentioning the idea of the case studies, Dr. Hensen stated that using case studies from the course text might be a good idea because he was not going to have a test on the book. A case study from the text that included a reactive guide would bring the students "into contact with the book." This was a concern to him because he had a "feeling that there was very little reading of the material going on." He reasoned that designing tasks that connect students to their text is one way he could get them into the reading of the text without having to test them on the material.

Dr. Hensen also considered the amount of time the fluency task would require. He explained that he wanted the task to take no more than half of the class period. This was an important consideration due to the amount of content he wanted to cover. He said:

I have got to work out for the length ... in terms
of how much time that it takes. ... I must get to vocabulary on Monday. There has to be at least half the class related to vocabulary activities. I think that is critical.

Dr. Hensen proceeded to examine several cases in the course text and a passage in Understanding Reading Problems: Assessment and Instruction (Gillet and Temple, 1990). He was trying to decide which case would best correlate with getting the concept of fluency across to students. He orally read a selection on "Scoring an IRI" (an informal reading inventory) from the Gillet and Temple text and noted that:

... I think this is too much for beginners to fool around with ... I will tell you right now, we are not going to do that.

I presented a passage to Dr. Hensen that I had used with college students in a reading course to demonstrate a miscue analysis. I thought he could use it for the fluency task he was developing. He looked over the passage and said he might be able to use it, but he would have to add some additional information in order to take students through a "whole reasoning process."

He then began to elaborate further on the fluency task plan, saying:

The first thing I can do is have them (students) do a task which says, 'What is reading fluency and why is it important?' Those are critical. Now having
said that then we can look at this [the handout I shared, Appendix J] and see if we can figure that out. Now we have not listened to the kid. It is a little hard in that sense, but I can make up a speed thing.

Dr. Hensen continued to examine the passage I had given him, while making statements about how he could adapt the handout to the goals of the task. For example, he said he could slashes to the passage to indicate phrasing and he could add information about speed. This information would require the students to go to the speed chart in the course text.

Next, Dr. Hensen and I shared some passages we used with students in the past to make specific points about comprehension. I learned from Dr. Hensen that such "text disturbance" passages were popular during the seventies. They were used to help educators understand what people did when they read. Dr. Hensen told me that he used such passages for awhile, but stopped because students had experienced them in one way or another. He explained further that he "was not sure about the transfer from them because I think people saw them as cute little tricks. I don't know what it did to their belief system."

After sharing our experiences, Dr. Hensen returned to studying the miscue analysis passage for a brief time reiterating adaptations he could make. He then summarized the direction he might take. He said he might give the
students "one more shot at fluency" and then move to vocabulary for a couple of class sessions, and later follow with comprehension. He also expressed concern that he may be simplifying the course by breaking it up into pieces: "fluency piece, vocabulary piece, comprehension piece."

He said:

I have this sickening feeling that I am just giving these folks too much information to process and make sense of, and so they are missing the important stuff. He stated three questions he could use to help the students focus on the important concepts, questions which would help them build their "belief system in a systematic way."

These questions included:

What are the four or five major concepts about reading that are important to you in your teaching? How does that relate to instruction? How do they drive instruction?

Dr. Hensen next returned to the development of the fluency task. He began to write notes as he restated several possibilities:

I want to start out with a free write, what is fluency in oral reading and why is it important?

Another task I could give them ... is to get them to create a graphic organizer for the concept of fluency. ... That could lead into the vocabulary piece. What is oral fluency in reading, I might get a definition
rather than a concept. I want them to describe it conceptually, not definitionally.

Dr. Hensen liked some of the fluency task ideas better than others. For example, he said he liked the idea of the students developing a graphic organizer by working in pairs over a free write because it allowed the students to talk with others about fluency.

The level of difficulty regarding the miscue analysis passage was a concern. Over a period of about twenty-two minutes Dr. Hensen developed a set of questions that he would use with students to assist them in the task of determining level of text difficulty as it relates to fluency. The following are examples of those questions:

What sight word miscues did they [the readers] make?
What word identification miscues did they make?
What was the rate of reading?
What was the error rate?
What other interesting, important, significant features did you [the teacher] notice?
What is the level of difficulty?
What judgments are you making?
What evidence of monitoring was apparent?
What instructional decisions might you make to help this student?

Dr. Hensen stated that his development of these questions was kind of reinventing the model used in the course text,
yet it comes from his mind. He remarked, "It is a basic decision making model."

Next, Dr. Hensen sketched a plan for the fluency tasks in his notebook. He said he would "put these on paper" for the students so they could begin "to think about the concept of task sneaking up on them." The fluency tasks that Dr. Hensen planned and sketched in his notebook consisted of the following:

I. In groups of two or three, brainstorm major features of the concept of fluency. Create a graphic organizer for these features. Share the organizer with other groups and note similarities and differences or revise the organizer if you wish.

II. Passage Analysis

Purpose: Analyze pupil's reading fluency.

In margin indicate how many reading errors/miscues are in every line (Group).

Compare your analysis with another group. Give the number of errors and specific errors. Provide reasons.

Dr. Hensen said he would collect the graphic organizers the students do in class and make a booklet.

As Dr. Hensen wrote out these tasks he commented, "I'm going to start designing my tasks so they (students) can see them more explicitly." He explained that this would reveal the task environment to students as well as the purpose of the task, which in this case was to develop
personal conceptions of reading fluency.

According to Dr. Hensen, these tasks on fluency would provide him with a real sense of where the class was, something he wanted to focus on more than he had in the past.

9:38 – 9:48 A.M., Summation of the Fluency Task

As the tasks on fluency were coming into focus for Dr. Hensen, he expressed some approval:

This is beginning to get [to be] a very complex task, but I like it. ... I think I finally pulled fluency together in a way that I like. At the same time, he expressed concern by saying:

I hope this isn't too compartmentalized. I've never brought it together this way. ... I'm really up for emphasizing the decision part. I'm not sure whether this book [the course text] pushed me to do that or not, the way they set it up.

He also stated that the course text was not real clear on its presentation of the fluency issue. He said:

A novice wouldn't pick up on it unless you structure a framework for them.

Following the lengthy discussion on fluency, Dr. Hensen said, "Wow! Two hours of planning for something that I already know about. Imagine what will happen for what I don't know about."

Dr. Hensen went on to say that there has been a lack
of any real consistency in what he has done in the assessment course. He explained that he had not taught the course consecutively because of other commitments with the university. Over the past several years he had been involved in different activities, depending on the needs. Therefore, he had invented some tasks for a particular class that he let "disappear" when they were completed by the students. However this was not a concern for him. He said the tasks would show up again if they were salient. He described his thinking about this process as evolutionary. He said:

I can tie lots of this thinking to way, way back. I mean I can tie it to fifteen years back dealing with this course. So it's not ungrounded, but it is still not as grounded as it ought to be.

Next, Dr. Hensen discussed the topic of vocabulary. He said:

Okay, vocabulary. Where are my notes on vocabulary? I have lots of notes on vocabulary. I went over this chapter [chapter 5 in the course text].

While Dr. Hensen was looking for his notes, I informed him that I had also read the chapter and thought it was a pretty good chapter on vocabulary.

9:48 - 10:03 A.M., Vocabulary Discussions

Dr. Hensen said he liked the vocabulary chapter because it contained some "important stuff" on vocabulary. Having found his notes he began to design some vocabulary tasks
that would highlight some of the important concepts. According to Dr. Hensen there were several critical questions in his mind as he looked at the chapter. The five he mentioned were:

1) What is a word and what is a concept?
2) How are they different and how does that difference affect understanding?
3) What is metaphorical word meaning?
4) How are words learned?
5) What about vocabulary instruction?

Dr. Hensen focused on designing vocabulary tasks that he believed would provide students with opportunities to be active participants. His goal was to have students develop an awareness of vocabulary development in the process. He suggested some approaches for accomplishing the goal. He said he could use a reaction guide in class and later send the students out on a field assignment related to vocabulary in their schools. He explained that he wanted the students to gain a broad developmental view of assessment by using their own work. The students would bring the completed assignment back the next week to do further analysis. A second possibility was to use Slavin's idea of jigsaw learning. He said he could have groups (four or five students in each group) contemplate the critical questions listed above. Each group member, using the course text as a source, would concentrate on one of the questions
and become the "expert." Then each member would share what s/he had learned with the other members of his/her group.

Dr. Hensen described vocabulary as a "fuzzy concept" for him. Therefore, he was has "never been impressed with the work related to vocabulary." He said:

Besides, that, I always found that it didn't make any difference what I said about it [vocabulary instruction], because they [the students] all went and just assigned vocabulary words, and the kids locked them up.

Nevertheless, Dr. Hensen noted several ways students could branch out from just giving kids words to look up. They could use semantic mapping, cloze procedures, and so on.

I shared that as an elementary classroom teacher I too had been guilty of just assigning a list of words for students to look up. However, later in my elementary classroom teaching career, I looked very closely at that process. I asked myself why I was having students do that. I questioned the meaningfulness of such and assignment. I realized that some students in the class already knew all the words on a vocabulary list for the selected story. However, there could be words in the story they would have difficulty understanding. Therefore, I changed my approach to teaching vocabulary. I decided to go over the words in the basal lesson with the class as a whole to quickly check background knowledge relative to those words. Instead
of requiring the students to write definitions of sentences for each word on the list, I provided them with some options. They could choose the words they would define. I encouraged them to play around with different ways to represent the meanings. For example, they could use their selected words in sentences, they could write a definition, use synonyms or antonyms, design crosswords, or whatever to help them learn the words with which they were not familiar. As a follow up, the students could add vocabulary words to their list from their reading that they didn't know, words they found interesting, or unique words. I then encouraged them to use as many of the words as they could throughout the week. Dr. Hensen told me that I was developing an environment for students to explore interesting words, words that were important to them.

10:03 – 11:11 A.M., Developing a Vocabulary Task

Dr. Hensen's planning for vocabulary returned to task development. He proposed: "Let's give these folks some of their own medicine," a vocabulary test. He and I began to skim chapter 5 of the course text for some words that could be used to make up a vocabulary test for the students in his class. We each verbally identified some. The following words surfaced as possibilities: coterminus, distinction, analogous, lexicon, meaning, vocabulary, and word. The word coterminus stumped Dr. Hensen and me. So, Dr. Hensen searched for a dictionary to clarify its meaning.
He could not find a dictionary, but this event led to my sharing an idea that I had used with my fifth graders when doing vocabulary study.

The idea really came to me by accident while teaching a reading lesson. While the students and I were discussing a word which had several meanings, Tom spontaneously raced to the book shelf where the dictionaries were stored. He got a dictionary from the shelf, took it to his desk, looked the word up, and read the definition to the class. Susan noted that her dictionary had a different definition than the one Tom read. This incident led to a rich discussion on dictionary meanings and what different dictionaries offer. From then on, my students and I decided to have a "dictionary expert" on hand whenever we had a reading lesson.

The practice found its way into other school subjects. The students enjoyed this activity and started taking turns being "dictionary expert" for the content areas of study as well, areas such as science and social studies. Dr. Hensen agreed that the "dictionary expert" was a nice idea and incorporated it into his plans. He said he would share it with students as part of what they would do in the vocabulary task he was developing and as an idea that they could use with children in the classroom.

As we developed the list of words for "the test", Dr. Hensen stated that he also wanted the students to be cognizant of how we arrived at the words for the vocabulary
test. What was our criteria? So, we began to generate some reasons for our word selection. The reasons we generated included: 1) a word that people know but don't use very often, 2) a word that is common, 3) a common word that has a specialized meaning, and 4) a word that is used frequently.

Dr. Hensen made the vocabulary task easier for the students by confining all of the selected words to those that occurred within a few pages in the chapter, the bottom of page 99 to the top of 101. The task was beginning to take shape as Dr. Hensen described his thinking:

So now, the test is, all right, to define these words, all right. A, first alone, by memory. Then B, with vocab pals, how many, one, two? Two, two vocab pals. C, with pals, oh well, what do they have to do? Ah, first alone by memory, wait a minute. (Pause) I have another step that I want in here, all right, exchange papers and grade.

Dr. Hensen then assessed his task by asking himself, "Now what the hell do I get out of all of that? By having them to do that?" He noted that it all goes back to that first question, what is a word? When the students have completed the task they should understand that a word is simply a "labeling, a confined thing." According to Dr. Hensen, this is important to know because teachers often confuse kids with the notions of "word" and "concept."

114
Dr. Hensen next moved to developing a task to assist his students' understanding of "concept building." He pointed out that generally a vocabulary test is a word test, not a conceptual test. He stated that he wants students to understand vocabulary conceptually without getting too abstract because they did not spend a lot of time on vocabulary during the last semester. Dr. Hensen and I discussed the difference between a word and a concept briefly. He then began to explore some ways to develop the notion of concept with students. As he talked he generated several ideas. For example: 1) students could brainstorm and create a concept map; 2) they could work in small groups for a limited amount of time to list as many words related to vocabulary as they could think of; 3) he could combine the student contributions into a master list; and 4) the students could group the words on the master lists into categories.

I told Dr. Hensen that I believed the implementation of these ideas would provide students with something beyond what they would find in a teacher's manual. Dr. Hensen decided to skip the section in the chapter five about extended meanings and metaphors. He said he could pick it up when he develops tasks for the concept of comprehension. He explained that it would be too much to present to the students at this time. He spent the next ten minutes discussing several issues. He discussed: 1)
a concern that students acquire an understanding of reading as it is in the schools procedurally and conceptually; 2) the assessment course as a critical thinking course; 3) what novices get from their experiences; 4) that it is very important for his students to understand what they are doing, whether it is traditional or not; and 5) that his thoughts about the assessment course are coming together in a more cohesive way because of the process that he and I are involved in.

Dr. Hensen turned his thoughts back to planning the task for vocabulary. He said he was happy about where he was headed with the vocabulary task. The task he created as he talked consisted of the following ideas: 1) In small groups (two or three in each) list as many words as you can that relate to vocabulary; 2) compare your list to another group and make a master list; 3) group words from the master list into categories (larger groups with six members); and 4) share with one other group, or large group depending on time.

To follow these group activities, Dr. Hensen said he would summarize what a concept is by having the class participate in a large group discussion. First, he would have individual students write a comparison between the concept of vocabulary and the concept of word. Then each student would share his/her comparison with a classmate in small groups. Each group would then be asked to make
a statement about what they shared. Dr. Hensen stated that meanings of concept and word should emerge from those statements.

Near the close of our planning session, Dr. Hensen talked through the development of a field assignment he wanted to use as a follow up on class activities. He intended that the assignment get the students to recognize and see examples of the development of word meaning and conceptual meaning. The assignment that he sketched out on paper as he talked through the plan read:

During this week observe instructional instances of the development of vocabulary both at the word and/or conceptual levels. Record several examples of these instances and write a reaction which includes your perception of the influence on the learner.

Dr. Hensen commented that he liked this assignment.

11:11 - 11:15 A.M., Closing the Planning Session

The second planning session ended as Dr. Hensen reiterated some ideas for using case studies from the course text. He also talked about how the literature in basal reading series is improving. The newer basals were doing a much better job at matching the reading passages to the background knowledge of children. He closed by sharing that he once thought about doing a discourse analysis on Rudolph the Red Nosed Reindeer in terms of the inferences children have to make to understand it. For example, what
does it mean when children sing:

and they all laughed and sang, and said Rudolph the Red Nosed Reindeer you'll go down in history.

I said, "What does that mean, yeah." We packed up our materials and headed to our respective homes.

**Class Meeting 2**

Class began at 12:00 p.m. and ended about 2:45 p.m. It was evident that Dr. Hensen was unable to work in all he had planned for this session. Following the class, he conducted a session on job interviewing for the students who wished to remain. The job interview session lasted for about an hour and six minutes. Then, Dr. Hensen and I met briefly for our debriefing session.

**12:00 - 12:08 p.m., Beginning the Class**

Dr. Hensen, wearing a tie and sports jacket, entered the classroom at 12:00 p.m. sharp. He immediately asked the students if anyone had case studies to hand in. Receiving none, he organized his notes and handouts at the front of the room. As he sorted the materials, two students stood at the front of the room talking with him. Other students were talking among themselves, eating snacks, and getting settled for class.

About 12:03 p.m. Dr. Hensen spoke to the class as a whole. Standing behind the stationary counter at the front of the room, he said, "I like the way Janet brought me some work that students have done." The students quieted down
and gave him their attention.

The only model matter Dr. Hensen addressed was that he still had some of the students' language arts projects in his car. He told the students he would bring them in during the break. Dr. Hensen then turned and erased the information that had been left on the chalkboard from a previous class.

Next, Dr. Hensen announced to the class that there were two things he wanted to accomplish. First, they would use the assessment framework they had developed last week to finish up the notion of fluency. Then they would examine the topic of vocabulary with a focus on important issues about teaching vocabulary, and what it means to be a teacher in terms of understanding children. Dr. Hensen wrote the words fluency and vocabulary on the board. He explained two reasons for doing assessment: 1) to understand children as learners, and 2) to transfer what they were learning into instructional decisions. Next, Dr. Hensen collected last weeks field assignment from the students who had it completed. He allowed additional time to complete the assignment for those who needed it.

12:08 - 12:11 P.M., Distribution of Fluency Tasks

Dr. Hensen announced that he had two tasks for the class. These tasks would finish up the issue of fluency. He handed two students the handout on fluency to distribute to the class. The handout was titled "Understanding Reading
Fluency" and contained Task #1 and Task #2 (See Appendix K). As the two students distributed the handout, Dr. Hensen talked to the class about why fluency was an important topic to discuss. He explained that fluency "represents a lot of the way that kids put together information. It indicates what they know about reading and how they put that information together. That's what fluency is all about."

12:11 - 12:39 P.M., Fluency Task #1

Dr. Hensen explained to the class that the task was designed to get them to develop their own conception of fluency, something that they would be comfortable with. He asked the students to "get with one or two other people and work into a group kind of setting." He explained that once the groups were formed, they were to follow the procedures outlined on the handout. The students divided into groups for the task, forming twelve groups: four dyads, six groups with three students in each group, and two groups with four each. At the direction of Dr. Hensen, they looked at the task description to see if they had any questions. He told the students not to start Task 2 until he directed them to do so.

Shortly after the students started reviewing the task handout, one student informed Dr. Hensen that they did not know what a graphic organizer was. Dr. Hensen proceeded to clarify the meaning of a graphic organizer. The following conversation is representative:
DH - Oh I have a wonderful question. I think it was Duffy and Rohler, page 257, is where that was. But the graphic organizer, I know you all have done it, you just don't have the label for it. You know a graphic organizer is a picture ...or you call it, you've heard structured overviews. You put them together on the page somehow. Relate, you know, it's not only the pieces but how they relate. Is that clear? Graph it in terms of being a picture. What, you know semantic maps? A semantic map is a graphic organizer. I make them all the time, yeah. So you do this thing called what, fluency right. And then you have a lot of things that are gonna be related to it. So draw me a picture of how you might relate those things, okay, you follow me? ....

I want a picture with words, with your concepts, you follow me? So give me one word that relates to fluency that you generated.

$S_1$ - Reading

DH - Reading, okay. Give me another one.

$S_2$ - Intonation.

DH - Intonation, all right. Now what you want to do is figure out how do these words relate to this given all the other words you generate, too. I want you to organize your ideas related to fluency, okay. More questions? Interesting, because I made an
assumption that an organizer is something (you use) all the time. You know when, what's that thing when we got together on the floor and, what were we doing that time? You made me those pictures, oh when we were referring judgments and statements, observations. We were doing graphic organizers then okay. All right. I can see that this task is going to take more than five minutes. Think about where we were last week when we talked about fluency. What kind of things were in fluency?

Following this exchange, the students worked in groups on task one for about twenty-seven minutes. Dr. Hensen walked from group to group, assisting and making comments. About twenty-four minutes into the group work, Dr. Hensen said:

I see some of the models, a thing that's missing from some of those models is a consideration of error rate difficulty issue. Okay, how does that fit into your model? Does that affect fluency?"

At the completion of this segment Dr. Hensen asked the students to put their names on their models so he could give them credit for their work. Several students then shared the name of their model with the class. Dr. Hensen explained that he did not want them to explain their model at this point, only share the name of their model. He said he would make copies of the models and distribute them
at a later time. The students would have an opportunity to explain their models then. Some of the titles which students gave their models were: "Concept of Fluency: To the Heart of the Matter," "Knowledge Flowing Down the River," "Boxing in Fluency," and "Fluency Graphic Organizer." Dr. Hensen pointed out that in some of the models the students were beginning to create criteria for assessing fluency.

12:39 - 1:12 Fluency Task #2

Next, Dr. Hensen asked the students to look at Task #2. He verbally went over the directions of the task with them and stated the purpose of the task. He said the purpose was for them to:

Go back and analyze the pieces, if you will, for the important features of a kid's reading fluency. The questions that I ask you in this task are related to what I think is important in a kid's reading fluency.

The students continued working in the same groups they had for Task #1. Dr. Hensen asked them to note the errors that Rob had made and to record the errors in the place provided on the handout (Appendix L). He explained the markings on the handout and told the class that he would be happy to consult with anyone who needed help.

The students began working in their groups on the task at hand. After about nine minutes, Dr. Hensen asked them if they had completed the first part of task 2. He told them not to go to 2A on the handout yet because they had
not received the information needed to do 2A. Dr. Hensen also told the students they did not have to move to another room. A note was on the classroom door saying that the teacher who usually teaches in that room during this time was sick. He then passed out the information the students needed for 2A (Appendix M).

The students worked on task 2A for about nineteen minutes. While they were working, Dr. Hensen asked them if they felt comfortable with the amount of discussion they had had within their groups relative to Rob's miscues. The students indicated that they were comfortable. He told them to eliminate the activity of sharing their responses with another group (Task 2, #2 under procedures), but continue working part 2A, the important features of fluency.

1:12 - 1:22 P.M., Break Time

Dr. Hensen told the students that they might want to take a break for about ten minutes and that he would like for them to get something done relative to the questions on the handout about 'instructional decisions.' Few students dispersed. Most of them remained working on the task. At 1:20 P.M., Dr. Hensen asked the students to move to another room across the hall because the room in which they were working was too hot. The students put their desks back in rows and proceeded to another room.

1:22 - 2:08 P.M., Discussion of Task #2

Dr. Hensen led a class group discussion on the features
of fluency (Handout 2A) following the break. He used the passage on Rob's reading to emphasize issues about fluency. He directed the students' attention to the point that whenever a teacher makes assessment hypotheses about a student, s/he should keep in mind that the hypotheses are tentative based on the current information. The analysis of "Rob's reading" continued for about forty-six minutes with a focus on the issues of difficulty level, rate of speed, error rate, and meaning changes. The following is an excerpt from the discussion which reveals how the discussion flowed:

DH - So, how many people here then tend to think that this is a difficult passage for this kid? Borderline or difficult for him? [Several students raised their hands]. All right, now, somebody that doesn't think that, would you raise your hand and comment? Sue

Sue - I had instructional to borderline.

DH - Okay, explain that please.

Sue - Well, I had twenty-one total errors, and I only had twelve that changed the meaning. So while he did have some errors in there, if I look, the majority of them made sense to me, or a lot of, you know.

DH - Give an example please.

Sue - When he said sheeps for sheep, I didn't think,
I didn't count that as changing the meaning cause see I was interested in understanding the plural of that, so I didn't count that. And when he said don't for do not, I didn't think there was a problem with that cause it means the same thing. For worker and work dog, I think he had the basic understanding, he did all of his work and that was a work dog.

DH - So because of those kinds of qualitative interpretations you were making, you were pushing it back towards, maybe he could handle this, okay.

Jane - Mindy and I tend to agree with Sue for the same reasons. We got about twenty-five and eight. Other students agreed with these comments.

DH - Twenty-five and eight? Okay. Let me ask this, total number of errors, were you all around twenty-three or twenty-five? Isn't that nice when you just do total number? You see one of the reasons why they like that and say just boom, everything is an error, there it is and that's what your figures are made of, if you will, versus now meaning change. What's meaning change? How many people got eight or less meaning change errors? All right. How many people got more, eight or more? All right, let me do it this way too. How many people got six? Seven? Eight? Nine? Ten? Okay now we're up to, but our range, there's only six to ten, but that's still, if you're looking at an average, probably
around seven or eight. You can see, now you begin to get into different interpretation. Why would you get into different interpretation; what changed the meaning? Why would that not be as straightforward?

The discussions continued in a similar manner. Students shared their analyses of Rob's reading and in the process talked about how they determined sight words, the meaning kids get from reading, the purpose of having kids read orally, intonation, speed, what constitutes an error, and the level of student performance.

Opportunities also arose during the discussion for Dr. Hensen to share some content knowledge relative to the course. For example, one student described how she reads. Dr. Hensen then explained the technical terminology for what she had explained:

S - I know I do it when I'm orally reading. My eyes are ahead and I only say the important words. And I just don't consider a, and, and the, you know, is it real important that, made a difference in one who's reading.

DH - That's what, a real possibility. That thing by the way is called, in case some person in the world ever asks you this, let's say you're reading along, the boy went to the store, and you're finishing up the sentence here all right, and you're over here with your mind, is what happens and you're going, the boy,
and you've already finished the sentence in your mind, it's called the eye voice span.

An interesting conversation also surfaced about a commercial that had been airing on several radio and television stations. The commercial claims that a person can learn to read by listening to cassette tapes on phonics. Betsy told Dr. Hensen that she and some of her friends had heard the commercial on the radio after class last Monday. Dr. Hensen said, "That's the last thing I heard before I came in here." Betsy then said that they had heard it on the way to class also and wondered what he thought of "this deal." He explained:

DH - Yeah, oh it's, in that you can just kind of hear the tape. My father wants to know what the hell I've been doing all these years. [Students laugh]. That's how I got it. Oh, I get sick every time I hear it, you know, well no, I'm beyond getting sick, I just, you know, it's great. This guy's making a lot of money and somebody's making a lot of money and probably making people feel better. And the kids who get it and do real well with it are probably kids who are at home reading books with their parents and learning to read like mad. It's like where there's a will there's an A. [Students laugh]. Have you seen that one? Some of that stuff is seeping beyond seven o'clock in the morning. As a general rule I won't buy anything that's
advertised before seven o'clock. [Students laugh].
[A student who was sitting next to me said, "That's worth writing down."]

At the end of the discussion on the important features on fluency, Dr. Hensen briefly summarized what had taken place thus far in the class session. He pointed out to the students that they were using their "own stuff" to decide what issues were important relative to fluency; issues like speed, sight words, error rate, monitoring, etc.

Next, Dr. Hensen reviewed the framework for assessment which he and the students constructed in last week's class session. He emphasized that the assessment framework was one way for teachers to gather data they need to make decisions about a student's performance. The basic guidelines for the model included: "Ask what am I looking at, make some judgments about that, and then make some informed decisions as a teacher." Dr. Hensen cautioned the students to be careful as they analyze a child's performance. He reiterated that issues like the context, circumstances under which a child performs, and the child's perception of the task must also be considered.

Dr. Hensen then collected the work that his students had done in class on the features of fluency. The students did not do the back side of handout 2A due to lack of time.

2:08 - 2:45 P.M., Vocabulary Tasks

Dr. Hensen announced to the class that he had two tasks
for them on vocabulary as he distributed a handout entitled
"Understanding Vocabulary Development" to the class (Appendix
N). The first task the students were to do was a vocabulary
test. Very seriously, Dr. Hensen said:

I want you to write a definition for distinction,
analogous, lexicon, vocabulary, and word. And you
are to ask no one, you are not to cheat. This is to
be a signed pledge. And you are to use no books. This
is not a collaborative endeavor.

Immediately the students behavior suggested a rise in
anxiety. One student asked in a nervous voice, "We're
not turning this in?" Another asked, "Is this to monitor
how much we've been reading?"

Dr. Hensen's sense of humor surfaced as he proceeded
to tell the students that this is "a test of general
intelligence, not anything as simple as monitoring your
reading." Shortly, he told them that he was just kidding
and highlighted how context changes things. He informed
the students that they could use the test any way they
wished; to monitor their reading, to assess their
intelligence, whatever.

The students worked on the task of "taking the test"
for about four minutes. Dr. Hensen then told them:

What I would like you to do now is with your neighbor,
compare answers and revise your definition if you would
like.
For about two and a half minutes the students compared their answers with a neighbor and revised their definitions. Dr. Hensen then asked for some volunteers to go to the board to write their definitions. Several volunteers went to the board and each wrote a definition. One definition for each word was represented on the board. As the volunteers were writing their definitions on the board, Dr. Hensen asked the other students to read very quickly from page 99 to the top of page 101 in their course text. He commented several times to the students while they were reading, to "read faster." One student mumbled, "Oooóóóóóo, need to take speed reading." Dr. Hensen explained that this reading should be a skimming since they were to have read the material prior to class.

Dr. Hensen and the students then proceeded to "check the test." The students were allowed to change any definitions before starting the check. Dr. Hensen jokingly told the students that he would need a grade for his book before the day was over. To check the definitions he lead a discussion on each of the words as to whether they were correct or not. The reading of the text (pages 99 to top of 101) and dictionaries were used to determine the correctness.

During the checking process, Dr. Hensen used the "dictionary expert" idea we had discussed in the previous planning session. First, the student who wrote the
definition on the board read it to the class. Dr. Hensen then asked the class if they had similar or different definitions. If the definitions were different, he asked a student to read the definition of the word from a dictionary which she had in her notebook. Another student, who had a different dictionary, added her dictionary definition which had a slightly different meaning. From then on Dr. Hensen had the two students check the meanings in the dictionaries as a final contribution to the discussion. For example, the checking of distinction proceeded as follows:

"Distinction. Is this correct or incorrect? (Referring to the definition written on the board). How many people say this is correct? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, ... 26. How many people say it's incorrect? Nobody says it's incorrect? Characteristic which makes something unique or different. Missy, since you've studied this in depth, would you mark this correct or incorrect?

Missy then read the third and first definitions from the dictionary to clarify the meaning of distinction. Another student then read the definition from her dictionary, noting a different part of speech. One student pointed out to Dr. Hensen that he did not tell them whether the word was a verb or a noun. Dr. Hensen responded by saying:

Listen, you know, what can I tell you? You want so
many rules for this. I'll tell you what, I'll do. I will change the scoring for this if you can go out and if you can go to your classroom and find that vocabulary isn't tested in a similar way, that the noun, whether it's a noun or a verb, it's function in a sentence is always given when it's tested, okay. I'll do the same for you. I'm just testing you the way I see kids tested, that's all.

After determining the correctness of each word on the test, Dr. Hensen then asked the students to assign a grade of A, B, C, D, or F to their papers. One student commented, "I failed," which got several laughs from the group. Dr. Hensen then jokingly remarked, "Well, see me after class. We will have a little remedial session."

On a more serious note, for about eleven minutes, Dr. Hensen led a discussion to highlight the significance of the task that he just had the students do. He asked the students to focus on the process that people go through when attempting to define a word. He asked, "When you were trying to define them [the vocabulary words], what was going through your head?" Some of the students responded: "Put words in a sentence;" "Think about the meaning of the root word;" "Create relationships with other words;" "Look the word up" (having already marked it wrong of course); "Try to break the word apart and look for something familiar;" "Use knowledge of prefixes and
suffixes;" and "think about what the word might mean and use context clues."

2:45 - 2:49 P.M., Bringing the Class to a Close

Following the discussion on strategies to use when defining a word, Dr. Hensen told the students that there was not enough time to do the second task on the vocabulary handout. So, Dr. Hensen explained the field assignment. He reminded the students to read the six or seven pages of the vocabulary chapter in the course text. He said:

Part of your field assignment next week, I am making an adaptation here, is to come back and be able to tell me what you think the difference between a word and a concept is, and how those two things are related to the concept of vocabulary.

A student asked him to repeat the last phrase. He responded:

Yes I will, if I can remember it. I want you to tell me what the difference is between a word and a concept and I want you to be able to tell me how both of those concepts relate to the concept or the word vocabulary.

Dr. Hensen continued the assignment saying:

... the second part is already written there, down at the bottom (Field Assignment #5, Appendix P).

Dr. Hensen collected some papers from the students and ended the class by telling the students to take about a ten minute break before a discussion on the interviewing process.
Debriefing 2

Teaching for almost three hours and then holding an interview session for an additional hour and fifteen minutes made a long afternoon for Dr. Hensen. I asked him if he wanted to talk or was he too tired. He said that he was not too tired and would talk for a bit. Therefore, this debriefing session did not last long, only six minutes. Mainly, Dr. Hensen shared his reflections relative to how things went in class. I listened to what he had to say and interjected a few comments such as "umhum," "right," and "yeah" to let him know that I was following his conversation. I did not ask many questions because I thought there would be other opportunities to talk when he would be more rested.

The following is a brief summary of the issues that Dr. Hensen discussed during the debriefing. He said that he "was very pleased with the way that the fluency thing went." He said that the task accomplished what he wanted it to, but he was surprised at how the graphic organizer "threw" the students. He explained,

I thought they had been working with that (graphic organizer), both in the schools and my class and Sara's class. But I guess we have not been using that term, and so that generically threw them for a loop.

Dr. Hensen commented that some of the graphic organizers looked interesting and he was anxious to look at them more
closely. He stated:

It highlighted the things that I wanted to highlight for most of them. There were some pieces missing, but I got the feeling it started to come together. He spent more time than planned on these tasks because as he said:

It just proved to me again, and again, and again how little they (the students) do get out of what we think we are doing with them (the tasks).

Dr. Hensen structures his courses so students do professional tasks that represent what they would do in their own professional development. However, he said the students had been treating what he had done so far in the course as "academic tasks," things you do to get a grade. He said the students had not been seeing the course work as relevant to their lives and classrooms, which is one of the things he tries to get them to do in his courses. Nevertheless, he thought he broke the barrier between the students' perceptions of academic tasks and professional tasks in the class. He said he felt real happy about that.

Next, Dr. Hensen explained that even though he shifted the class from group work to a class sharing of ideas, he was able to make some points that he wanted to make about the process of assessment. He said he was pleased with the large group discussion.

Dr. Hensen expressed disappointment with the vocabulary
part of the lesson. Part of the disappointment was due to lack of time to get everything done he wanted to do.

He stated:

I kept going in my head, I knew I did not have time to develop it, and I kept going in my head, how can I do the word and concept in the same thing. So I was gonna control the task and zip them through both, and then I still ran out of time and so we just ended up having a little fun and conceptually we did not go anywhere. So that is why I changed the task to think about that in a field assignment, (the difference between a word and a concept, and how they relate to the concept of vocabulary)

He went on to say:

That (running out of time) is kind of disappointing in terms of the time that I have got. Somehow I have got to get through vocabulary next week.

Nevertheless, he said that in general this was one of the better classes that they had had so far, especially the first two-thirds of it.

Thinking back on the class, Dr. Hensen said he thought he "laid down a few points" about "wordness" and the difficulty of wordness. He explained that he raised some curiosity in the students about how we teach, test, and evaluate vocabulary. He stated that it would be interesting to see what the students do with the field assignment since
their minds were on job interviews.

The debriefing session ended by Dr. Hensen saying that he thought the students' awareness was being raised and that he picked up on something in today's session that he had not thought about before. He said that he picked up on the strategies that his students were using to define the vocabulary words. He said that they were:

kind of self generated strategies and if I had known about that I would of made more of it, to tell you the truth. Which would be a good example of how they can lock into kids with their self-generated strategies to develop meaning.

Our session ended on this note. We gathered our materials and left the building together, talking casually as we walked to our cars.
Planning Session 4

The planning session described here was our fourth planning session, but a part of the third sequence. It lasted for an hour and forty minutes.

8:00 - 8:07 a. m., Beginning the Session

The session started with Dr. Hensen looking through the course text (Barr, Sadow, & Blachowicz, 1990) and some papers while I was setting up the tape recorder. Prior to his focus on the plans for the upcoming class, we discussed two topics. First, I asked Dr. Hensen if he had read the Vacca and Vacca text on content area reading (Vacca & Vacca, 1989). I was interested in his opinion of this text since I considered it to be one of the best texts I had ever read for teaching reading in content areas. The text provides a variety of strategies and information that could be helpful to teachers who were not familiar strategies for teaching reading as they teach content. I have found it to be an excellent reference in my own teaching. Dr. Hensen was familiar with the text and agreed that such a text may be a good tool to inform teachers about unfamiliar strategies. I also shared that I found Reading and Learning to Read (Vacca, Vacca, & Gove, 1987) to be a good foundations text in developmental reading for beginning teachers and just as informative as Content Area Reading. I had used this text text to teach a developmental reading course
and was quite impressed with the approaches to reading instruction that it contained.

Next, I asked Dr. Hensen if he had seen the article on portfolios in the 1991 VSRA journal. I brought the article to share with him because I thought it might contain some helpful information when developing a portfolio task, something he had talked about in one of our earlier meetings. He said he had not received his copy yet, but took a moment to glance through mine. As he scanned the publication he recognized a speaker's name who he had recently seen at a conference where he made a presentation. This sparked a brief discussion on conferences.

Dr. Hensen informed me that he would soon be going to Illinois to do a presentation. I found this part of his work to be quite interesting, since I have never presented at such a conference. My experiences up to this point had been limited to presentations at local reading conferences.

Following these exchanges, Dr. Hensen asked me if I had a copy of the chapter on comprehension from the course text. I reminded him that he made me a copy of the vocabulary chapter and the comprehension chapter at the end of our last planning session.

I told Dr. Hensen that I started reading the chapter on comprehension the night before our meeting, but had
not finished it. He shared that he, too, was going to read the chapter before our meeting, but only had a chance to look through it. He stated that the only major piece in the chapter that his class hadn't focused on was generating questions.

As a side point, I told Dr. Hensen that I had seen a shift in what was emphasized in the teaching of reading since I attended undergraduate school. It seemed to me that much more emphasis was being placed on observing what good readers do instead of what poor readers do. I liked the emphasis on what a good reader does because it allows beginning teachers to concentrate on the components that make up good reading, thus providing a good knowledge base for decisions. Dr. Hensen stated that that was an interesting point. He thought aloud, saying:

   Well, they (his students) know about inferences, but I don't know to what extent. So I'm thinking about that a little bit and ah, (long pause). I don't want to open too much.

He went on to discuss the kinds of things he wanted students to do in the next class.

8:07 - 8:11 a.m., Examining Materials

Dr. Hensen told me he wanted students to look at the types of materials currently used to teach comprehension and to examine the ways such teaching is
done. He had a copy of the Silver Burdett Ginn tests which he said he could use with the students to "get three or four things done with in one shot." They would be able to qualitatively analyze these tests and perhaps even rewrite some sections. He said that these tests were pretty typical of what is being used in the schools now.

I informed Dr. Hensen that the teachers in the county where the students were student teaching did not receive the Silver Burdett Ginn tests when they acquired the new textbooks. The tests were being revised by the publishing company. The revision took place because of the feedback the company had received from school systems using the tests. It was my understanding that many children were experiencing difficulty with the tests, particularly students in the lower grades. Therefore, the company re-evaluated the tests and made some changes. Dr. Hensen, while viewing a copy of the third grade test, stated that the phrasing of the test questions for the lower grade students may have contributed to the test difficulty. Phrases like "in the state of" and "in the act of" could be confusing to children. However, he said this would not pose a problem for the students in his class if he chose to use the tests for a task on comprehension. The students would be generating questions to use with the test passages instead of using the questions designed by the company. The students would then compare their
questions with the test questions. Dr. Hensen said this activity would help the students generate some important ideas about comprehension and they would gain a better understanding of "where they are now."

8:11 – 8:15 a. m., Getting the Comprehension Juices Flowing

Dr. Hensen stated that he sees two tasks emerging in this lesson under consideration. Since he and the students had discussed different types of texts and inferences in previous classes, he could go back and touch on those ideas in some way. He said:

What I might do is put together some kind of a list of some major comprehension concepts or whatever and figure out one little activity to get the comprehension juices flowing. .... Something that might include things like inferences, expository text, narrative text, and maybe a conception of comprehension, those kinds of things, relationship with vocabulary and understanding. Four, five, or six major concepts.

Immediately following the expression of his idea to list some major concepts, Dr. Hensen described an activity that he learned about at a meeting in Fairfax, VA. He judged that the activity might work to get the "comprehension juices flowing." He explained:

What you do is essentially form two concentric circles with the same number of people in it and then, one
stays stationary and the other moves .... So let's say you have six questions, the person asks the question and then they move on to the next one, and they ask the question. They get the same question, and so the one person gets to hear six answers to the same question. The other person gets to answer all six. I just switch people on the outside, while the people on the inside stay still. They get to answer six questions, and so you get a pretty good view of what other people think about a particular issue in a short period of time, both in depth and broad.

Reflecting on what he just said, Dr. Hensen stated this might be a good approach because "it's nice and interactive and it follows up on what we've been doing, ... that is kind of fun."

Another approach he considered as a possibility to "get the comprehension juices flowing" was to get students to "write a bit." He said he could present them with an "ice breaker question" or he could have them do a free write. According to Dr. Hensen, the purpose of either of these approaches would be to get students to activate prior knowledge about comprehension.

8:15 - 8:36 a. m., Emerging Task Ideas

The next idea Dr. Hensen considered was to have students participate in a task dealing with "questions
in the development of comprehension". He stated that he would go back to the text they used the previous semester (Duffy & Roehler, 1989) and use the framework they discussed then. He said that framework was "a nice categorization" for creating "text related questions and beyond the text questions." He then turned his attention to the text currently being used in the course (Barr, Sadow, & Blachowicz, 1990). While looking through chapter 6, "Comprehension: Its Nature and Development", Dr. Hensen pointed out that the way the questions were written for narrative passages in this text would be a nice comparison to the question framework his students studied last semester. He said he liked the idea of writing questions on a narrative passage because it would require students to first think about categories of story structure. Once the students were familiar with the categories, they could develop some "story structured questions" and some "detailed questions." He said he particularly liked how this text created "a difference between structured questions and detailed questions." He had not seen anyone do it that way before. He said he might have a whole bunch of kids' books in his car from which he could choose a story for his students to write narrative story questions.

Dr. Hensen told me he liked the way this text prepared questioning for expository text, by first outlining a
passage and then creating questions from the outline. He said it is possible that students could end up getting the opportunity to work with both approaches, writing questions for narrative texts and writing questions for expository texts. However he was concerned about the amount of time it would take to do both. He said:

My only problem of course, I do not know how long it will take to do this. I have no idea how long it will take. Absolutely none.

Another problem he stated was that if he used the passage "Restless Kangaroo" (a narrative passage in chapter 6) his students would already have the author's interpretations of the passage. Even so, he thought this passage would be a "nice template" for his students.

Continuing to explore the task possibilities, Dr. Hensen examined some more of the test paragraphs from the Ginn tests. At this point he explained his preference for the task "of taking the test paragraph apart." He looked at three different passages and read excerpts from each, searching for a passage that he might use to develop a comprehension task for students. Nevertheless, after examining the content of the passages and the kinds of questions that followed the selections, he expressed quite a distaste for these passages. Several times throughout the examination of test passages, Dr. Hensen made exclamatory remarks such as, "What a dumb story!" "That's
real stupid!" "God, they are awful!" and "I mean that is vomit city!" Dr. Hensen stated that he did not see what these test passages could tell a teacher that students' daily work did not reveal. He stated that the Ginn tests were far easier measures of accountability than what he would use.

At this point I shared some of my classroom experiences relative to such testing. I told Dr. Hensen that I felt the emphasis on testing was not near as stringent as it use to be. Even though chapter tests in the Ginn basal program are required to be administered in the school system where I taught, other means of assessment are beginning to take a strong hold. More emphasis is being placed on incorporating ideas like journal writing as a component of the overall assessment. Children can write a summary of what they read and their thoughts about it in lieu of just answering questions at the end of a story.

My comment about summaries led Dr. Hensen to write a note to himself that he wanted to include written and oral summaries in the tasks for his students so they would be able to compare questioning strategies with retellings. He stated that summaries could get by students if they were not included in the task. He continued to write some notes to himself as he talked, saying:

Let me make some notes to myself here. Field
assignment for retelling. I want this on an average kid. And this will be associated to the portfolio task eventually. All right.

He continued by sketching his ideas for what he wanted students to do in class:

So in class, I want to take a passage and I want to do story structured questions and detail questions. And then I will do it in pairs, and then compare and contrast ... I also want them to do an expository, and in that expository I want them to outline it, make questions, and elicit recall.

As Dr. Hensen and I continued to talk, he stated that he wanted students to see and understand the reading materials that were currently being used in the schools and how awful they were, materials like the Ginn test passages. Our conversation then turned to a focus on using "good" literature in the classroom in lieu of the kind of testing currently being used.

Lucado - Looks like they [test designers] could take some excerpts of something, some good literature you know.

Hensen - Well the problem is if it is any good they can not get it, they can not squeeze it in these [the tests] you know.

Lucado - Or cut down on some of the passages and use just one
Hensen - And use a longer one right, right. Because I mean look at what you could get all of that. I mean wouldn't it, that would seem to me to be a way to go.
Lucado - You could get your main idea, and your inferences, those things all in one.
Hensen - Sure, give them a nice story to read. That tells me something too, is that I want to give them [the students], even though it is a short time period, I am going to give them something half way decent. The text that I give them I think is important here. ... I could just take trade books and do it. Let me go upstairs and see what I have.

8:36 - 8:47 a.m., McGraw Hill Basals

Dr. Hensen went upstairs and returned with a couple of lower grade McGraw Hill basals. For about ten minutes, he talked about the design of this series. He highlighted such things as: the content ("well done literature"), the teacher's manual ("worst on the market"), overall strategies (thematic, with "typical stuff"), the incorporation of writing, and the reader response sections. He also explained how this reading series compared to others on the market. According to Dr. Hensen, one thing that contributed to the quality of the McGraw Hill readers was that the series was designed in response to criticisms from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
and other such organizations. Dr. Hensen also commented on his work experience with McGraw Hill for whom he was a consultant. He explained that he found that experience enjoyable and enlightening.

8:47 - 9:10 a.m., Searching for a "Good" Story

As stated earlier, Dr. Hensen wanted students to have some experiences with story structure questions and detail questions for narrative and expository texts. Following our discussion about the textbook company, Dr. Hensen began to look for a story in the McGraw Hill texts "worth putting together," that wasn't too long. He scanned five stories in the second grade text and made comments like "pretty good," "may be too long," and "too long." Then he looked at the first grade text. He scanned two stories, "Using Words About Home" and "Strange Bumps."

I commented that "Strange Bumps" had cute illustrations and the author, Arnold Lobel, has written some wonderful stories for children. Dr. Hensen noted that "Strange Bumps" was not too long and that he could probably use it. He said it looked like a worthwhile story with a good structure to it that would allow for prediction. However, he was concerned about making copies of the entire story, including illustrations, because it would take a good amount of paper.

Next Dr. Hensen examined the texts for a good expository story. He looked at "What Will the Weather
Be?" and expressed a liking for it because he is "a big old earth science guy." He stated that he thought this story would be substantive enough for the expository task. He examined some other stories in the first grade reader which he thought might be interesting and enjoyable for students to work with. He expressed appreciation for the quality of the stories in this first grade text and in particular said he liked "A Nest of Wood Ducks." He also looked at "Digging Up Dinosaurs" but asked himself, "Will it be expository enough?." He stated that the story on weather was just a kind of listing, while the ducks story had "a cohesiveness to it."

During the time that Dr. Hensen scanned the various stories in the McGraw Hill texts, he intermittently talked about other topics such as the use of basals in teaching reading, the novel approach to reading, personal reading, the McGuffey Readers, and a typical child's reading. For example, he said that when typical children are asked to read a book "they will find every single way they can not to read it. You watch them .... You can assign it to them all the hell you want. You can test them out the kazoo, and they will still find ways not to read it."

9:10 - 9:21 a.m., Task Development for Selected Stories

After examining several stories in the McGraw Hill readers, Dr. Hensen decided to use two comprehension passages with the students, "Strange Bumps" for the
narrative, and "A Nest of Wood Ducks" for the expository. Additionally, he decided to make complete copies of the two stories so as not to lose any content. "It would be a mistake," he said, if he did not include the illustrations with the text because his students may later want to use the stories with their students. Dr. Hensen said he would use the narrative framework on page 167 of Reading Diagnosis for Teachers (Barr, Sadow, & Blachowicz, 1990) to have the students examine narrative text structure. He then read through the story "Strange Bumps" to decide if the story fit the narrative text framework on page 167. This framework included the following categories: the setting, the initiating problem(s), actions, and consequences. Dr. Hensen said he would design a task sheet for students to use in class which would help them develop questions for the narrative story.

Dr. Hensen next directed his attention to the development of the expository task. He noted that his students would first (in groups) outline "A Nest of Wood Ducks." Then they would compare their outlines with those of another group, revise the outlines based on those comparisons, and use the outlines to develop some questions for their students. Finally, they would compare their questions with those of another group. Dr. Hensen commented that a task like this, once developed and
implemented, could become a component in a child's portfolio.

In response to Dr. Hensen's comment about portfolios, I said that I thought it would be a good idea to have representative samples of both a narrative passage and an expository passage in a child's portfolio. This would be of particular interest if the portfolio was a collection of a child's work over the entire school year. Getting back to developing the tasks, Dr. Hensen stated:

The other interesting thing that would be neat with this would be to get some of our first grade friends [the students working in first grade] to get a kid to read it and then retell it. Wouldn't that be nice for the next week? Both of these [narrative and expository text stories], that's what we could use for the retellings. Then we could really see a real kid doing that.

9:21 - 9:28 a.m., Developing a Framework for Teaching

For the next few minutes Dr. Hensen and I talked about how frameworks may be more helpful to teachers than specific mandates that are typically passed down from administrators. Frameworks could be used to establish school rules, to develop a strategic reading plan, and so on. I told Dr. Hensen that school wide rules often bothered me because it was difficult to enforce the rules that I did not agree with myself. He responded that
what you need is a framework for behavior that provides room for interpretation. Since our conversation, I have given this statement considerable thought. I believe it is important to help teachers establish such frameworks, either collectively where group members work together, building on each others ideas, or individually, to meet their own specific needs. As I reflect on my work with Dr. Hensen, it is clear to me that he is providing students with tasks that help them build such frameworks for their future teaching. For example, he talked about a "strategic reading plan" framework he helped the students develop last semester. It was a framework that could be displayed on the classroom wall and referred to when teaching reading.

I told Dr. Hensen that I found such frameworks to be helpful in my own teaching. Once you have a framework in mind, you can try it out in the classroom, play around with your ideas, and then modify the framework to fit your needs. Through such processes teachers can build a repertoire of frameworks through the years that they find useful and pragmatic.

9:28 - 9:30 a.m., Continued Exploration of Task Possibilities

Dr. Hensen again returned his attention to the possibility of using the Ginn tests for developing a comprehension task. He said:
I may just xerox more of these [the Ginn test passages], and then compare this to what they [the students] generate. Here is the book's testing on a passage, here is your testing.

However, Dr. Hensen was not quite sure how to work everything in the allotted class time that he wanted to do. He considered carrying some of this task to the next week when the students would have the retellings that their children did. As he continued reflecting on the possibilities, he talked and wrote the following notes:

Compare tests to basal story.

... in the following week I will ... heavily concentrate on retelling and summaries. Their field assignment is going to be related to all of this all right.

Dr. Hensen, reflecting on our process during this study, said:

Interesting thing now [is to] watch the two of us as we interact. We both kind of, you know, got caught with the story and then you think, oh that author .... Well, I am a science guy and that nest story with the hens, the expository just grabbed me. I was thrilled to find out wood ducks got in trees and the mother went back to the place she, I mean that's the real mark of good stuff, as opposed to how we reacted [to the Ginn test passages].
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9:30 – 9:40 a.m., Ending the Session

Near the end of our session, about 9:30, Dr. Hart walked in. Dr. Hensen and Dr. Hart began talking:

Hensen - Hi Sara.
Sara - How are you?
Hensen - Well good. You have a big meeting here this morning?
Sara - Yeah
Hensen - Yeah, great. What time?
Sara - Ten.
Hensen - Oh, we'll be out of your way.
Sara - I'm not, I just came in to listen (laughs).
Hensen - Oh we got our lesson just about done here....

I commented to Dr. Hart that we were having a great time reading first grade stories. Dr. Hensen continued by explaining to Dr. Hart what we had been doing and talking about. About 9:34 another professor arrived and Dr. Hensen shared a few main points relative to the wood ducks story with him, because he was also "into science" like Dr. Hensen. Dr. Hart then stated that "Reading to Learn" would like the wood ducks text because it was a nice, "comprehensive text." Then Dr. Hart and Dr. Hensen discussed some of the key points about the dinosaur story in the McGraw Hill text and current use of basal texts in the classroom. I listened and observed these two experienced professors interact and share their views
on the issue of using a basal approach as opposed to a novel/whole language approach. Basically, they talked about how the content and illustrations of basals have improved over time. However, I got the sense from their conversation that it is not the text per se that makes the difference in a child reading or not reading, but how a selection is presented.

Earlier in the planning session, Dr. Hensen told me that I might be interested in some of the McGraw Hill readers. At the end of the taping for this session, Dr. Hensen and I went upstairs and looked through some of the McGraw Hill basals. He gave me a few of the readers saying that I might get some good literature from them to use in the future.

Class Meeting 4
12:00 - 12:26 p.m., Beginning the Class

The class began in a different room because the "regular" room was being used to administer some state tests. The room was smaller and felt hot. The lights were off as the students entered the room and remained off during the class period. A small, movable teacher desk with a chair was at the front of the room. Dr. Hensen laid his materials and handouts on the desk.

The students were sitting in rows facing the front of the room as class began. Dr. Hensen was wearing a sports coat and no tie, was at the front of the room facing
the students as he talked. He began class by saying:
Would you please kind of take a sheet of paper out
and update me on your work status related to this
course. I see we we're getting a wide range. And
it's understandable given the break, and Christmas,
and interviews and worrying about all of that. So
just take a piece of paper out and let me know where
you are okay.

The students, some still talking with one another, began
writing a response to Dr. Hensen's request. Dr. Hensen
continued talking as the students wrote. He directed
the students' attention to some model matters. He said:

All right, now, couple of things. Where did I put
my notes? I didn't bring my notes. Let's see if
I can remember everything. First thing, is you have
social studies on Tuesdays, right? Okay, next Tuesday
is what you call it right,

Mary - PTA

Hensen - PTA, correct?

Mary - Umhum

Dr. Hensen explained to the class that he had spoken to
Dr. Walker (the students' instructor for curriculum in
social studies) about a conflict with the PTA meeting
and their having to drive to the university to take the
social studies class. He told the students that Dr. Walker
was willing to teach the class next Tuesday afternoon
at Mayfield. Therefore, Dr. Hensen suggested that they negotiate with Dr. Walker regarding the specifics. He reminded his students that the class could not be held at twelve, but would have to be one o'clock in order to get a classroom at Mayfield. He left this situation to the students to work out with Dr. Walker.

One student, referring to Dr. Hensen's opening request, said she was confused. She wanted to know if they were to write down the things they had already turned in. Dr. Hensen clarified the request:

Yeah, yeah. What you, well I'm really interested in what you haven't turned in, but you can write down what you did turn in.

Another student responded, "So if we turned in everything, you don't need anything. Dr. Hensen continued clarification:

If you write down what you have turned in, then write down what you haven't turned in and what your plan is. See there's some people that are all caught up and some that aren't. I've got a big range here and I want to have some sort of idea when I could expect stuff.

Dr. Hensen clarified a few more points and collected the papers from the class as they finished.

Many of Dr. Hensen's students had recently participated in job interviews. Therefore, the second
model matter discussion centered around the interviews his students experienced. Dr. Hensen wrote a one to five continuum rating scale on the board. He asked the students to rate their interview experience on a scale of one to five, five being the plus side and one the negative side. He noted that the students' experiences were rated more toward the positive end. He then asked them if any of the interview questions related to how students were prepared. He asked, "Did anybody get the question, what is the difference between a lesson plan and a lesson design?" One student responded that she did. Immediately the students brought up two other topics for discussion, Bloom's Taxonomy and assertive learning. Dr. Hensen elaborated on these topics. Talking about Bloom's Taxonomy and lesson design, Dr. Hensen explained:

Well I think particularly when you, today's task for example you'll be making up questions for both the narrative and expository stuff and really Bloom's Taxonomy is old. And most places, most research at this point doesn't use it because it's artificial in nature. And what you have to be careful of when you go to a school division and they ask you questions is, of course you wouldn't say that to them. You would differentiate between lower level and higher level responses. The lesson design and the lesson plan thing best as I can understand it is the lesson plan thing.
plan is a strategy for implementation of course and the lesson design involves you in actual establishment of the goal and the creation of the kind of procedures and the task environment that surrounds those procedures. I don't know what it is that they were after with that, but it might be an important beginning.

Another student then asked about the term "assertive learning." Dr. Hensen responded by asking, "Assertive discipline?" The student said, "No, learning, not discipline, assertive learning." Then Dr. Hensen replied, "Assertive learning. That's those learners that punch out the teacher." The students laughed. The student who asked the question pursued it, supported by several others who had also been asked about assertive learning in their interviews. In fact, according to one student, an interviewer commented, "I can not believe that you've gone through four years and not heard [the term assertive learning]. You should tell your supervisors that you need to know that." Several students in the class then asked, "What is it?" Dr. Hensen explained:

I can not believe that if it were a useful concept that I or some of my colleagues didn't (laughter). That would be my response back to them. Actually, what you have here is a good example in vocabulary and conceptual learning going on. Because what they
are doing is a lot of the tasks, a lot of the concepts that they are talking about you do have background knowledge, and what they have all right is a label. And another thing that you have is a lot of people running around in education looking for best methods and panaceas. And they run out there and they find it. In fact, now if that person that you were talking to, would you by any chance be talking about cognitive developmental learning and constructive standpoints, sir is that what you mean? Well we could talk about that.

Dr. Hensen thusly worked to provide students with ideas about how to respond to questions posed by interviewers.

Several other model related topics were discussed in the early part of this class session. These included: job availability, a meeting with next years student teaching group (so this group could share their experiences), spring break, teaching certification procedures, a lost and found pie plate, and the date for an end of classes gathering (a lasagne party).

12:26 - 12:35 p.m., Comprehension Task Warm Up

Dr. Hensen shifted from the train of thought about model matters to the topic of comprehension. He wrote the word, comprehension, on the board and said:

Well what I'd like you to do is this. Think, think now about comprehension all right. Put your mind
into the concept of comprehension. Comprehension.
Now I have a task for you. The task is, what? I
want to make sure I read it to you exactly as I wrote
it down. If you could tell a person, let's make
this an interview. You can choose your own audience,
either an interviewer or a parent or a colleague.
But pick somebody in your head. If you could tell
them three things that you would want to tell them
about the comprehension process, what would they
be, okay. Write those down.
The students wrote for about one and a half minutes.
Then, Dr. Hensen selected three rows of students to go
to the front of the room. He asked them to form a line
with their backs to the wall. He then asked the remaining
students to go to the front and each pair up with a person
in the line. In the previous planning session Dr. Hensen
had talked about doing this activity in a circle. However,
the arrangement of the room was not conducive. After
the students "matched up," one student was left without
a partner. Dr. Hensen became her partner. Dr. Hensen
guided the students through this activity as follows:

Hensen - Now what you do is, you have thirty seconds
okay for the three of you to exchange the three
things.
Sue - There's only two of us.
Hensen - What?
Sue - Two of us.
Hensen - Two. For the two of you to exchange the three things, okay. So exchange those. [The students exchanged their three statements with a partner in about 53 seconds.] All right, hold it. Move to your right one person.
Mary - Who?
Hensen - The outside people here, away from the board. These people away from the board move one place to the right. All right, you ready? Thirty seconds. [The students again exchanged their three statements, this time with a new partner in about 54 seconds.] Okay ready, shift to the right the outside people, one more time, okay. One more time. [This time the students took 71 seconds to exchange their statements.] Okay, take your seats please. [The students immediately returned to their seats.]

12:35 - 12:38 p.m., Discussion of the Warm Up

Dr. Hensen lead a brief discussion following this activity. The discussion focused on why such a task might be given to begin a class. Several students offered ideas: to get students involved in the task; to activate prior knowledge; and to develop a variety of ideas about comprehension. Dr. Hensen then told the students that the purpose he had for the activity was to get them in "the comprehension set."
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12:38 – 1:40 p.m., Developing Questions for Narrative Texts

Dr. Hensen asked the students to form groups for the upcoming task. He asked the students who were student teaching in the first and second grades to go to the front of the room. He then asked the rest of the class join those students to form groups so that each group would have three or four members. By organizing the groups in this manner, Dr. Hensen structured the groups so that each group had a primary grade student teacher represented.

Once the groups were formed, Dr. Hensen instructed the students to return to their seats according to their new group arrangement. In the meantime he passed out the task sheet, "Class Tasks for Development of Questions" (see Appendix 0) and a copy of the story, "Strange Bumps" by Arnold Lobel. Some students immediately began reading "Strange Bumps" once they received the task sheet. Dr. Hensen was not bothered by their immediate start because while continuing directions he said, "I see you are going ahead already, that is fine." However, at this point the students could only progress so far on the handout because they did not yet have a copy of the "narrative worksheet" (see Appendix 0). Dr. Hensen told the students first to read the passage. While they read the passage he distributed the narrative worksheet. Dr. Hensen
continued to explain the task for about five minutes. He highlighted several points: 1) that how you set up questioning for narrative and expository passages differs; 2) you want to be able to create assessment materials "that you have a good handle on in terms of the questions that you are asking;" 3) have some passages in your classroom that can be used to get a good grasp on the comprehension process; and 4) paying attention to story structure is important to the process of comprehension.

Dr. Hensen encouraged the students to use each other, their text, and him as a resource while working on the tasks. He directed them to compare their responses to the narrative task once they completed the narrative worksheet. Dr. Hensen told the students that they could go to another classroom to work in their group if they wished once they felt they were on target. He informed the students that page 167 in their text would definitely help them with the pattern for the narrative text.

The students worked on the task in their groups for about twenty-five minutes, which included the sharing with another group. While the students worked, Dr. Hensen sat at the teacher's desk in the front of the room reading through something. However, when students raised a concern or question, he got up from his seat and went to their group to help. Intermittently Dr. Hensen provided additional information relative to the task. For example,
at one point he said:

On page 155 in your text there is a set of questions that are generic, you know they're kind of a general question for setting, for action, etc. Use those as sort of a guide now when you check yours and see if you want to edit or revise your questions in any way.

Following the group work and sharing, Dr. Hensen and the students engaged in a twenty minute discussion about the kinds of questions they generated for the story "Strange Bumps." They focused on the following topics during the discussion: setting; the initiating event or problem; internal reactions; beyond text questions; reader response; action consequence, action consequence; dependent and independent questions; and consequence questions. Dr. Hensen told the students that he should have had them include the answers to the questions they generated.

After the discussion Dr. Hensen informed the students that he had placed a first and second grade person in each group so each student working in first and second grades could be able to get a child in his/her class to actually read the passage and respond to the questions their group had developed. This activity would enable them to see how real people do with the task, not just "smart college kids." Following this explanation, Dr.
Hensen directed the students to take a break. He said, "All right now, why don't you take a break. Wait a minute, any other questions? Did I cut any other questions off? Okay take a break. Let's get started at ten of two."

1:40 - 1:50 p.m., Break

The students took a break for about ten minutes. During the break they talked within their groups and some went to get a snack and soda.

1:50 - 2:33 p.m., Developing Questions for Expository Text

After the students entered the room following the break, Dr. Hensen informed them that they would examine expository text. However, before beginning the task, he instructed the students to make a correction on the story handout, "A Nest of Wood Ducks", because one student said a page was missing. As it turned out, only part of a sentence was missing. The students added the missing information to the story handout.

After making the necessary corrections, Dr. Hensen directed his students to read the story and state the main topic. He said, "I don't want you to go anywhere until you decide on a main topic." He told his students that "this is real teaching stuff, you can't take forever on this. Do it like teachers would do it." The students read the story and generated topics for about three and a half minutes. Dr. Hensen asked them to "take a shot
at the main topic." The names of the topics that the students shared included:

"A Year in the Life of a Wood Duck"
"The First Year in the Life of a Wood Duck"
"How Wood Ducks Take Care of Their Babies"
"Wood Ducks"
"The First Year of a Wood Ducks Life"
"The Life of a Baby Wood Duck"
"How Wood Ducks Grow Up"

Dr. Hensen responded to each idea as it was generated. He usually repeated the name of the topic and made a few supportive comments such as; "this is a woman, who if she hasn't read the first chapter in comprehension doesn't need to because she knows about the difference in articles ..." and (jokingly) "don't laugh at your colleagues." He recognized some of the students' ideas more strongly than others. For example, he once said:

Notice how your instructor gave his feeling word, OH. That was something. See you treat everybody the same right. I said oh good, good, good, OH THAT'S AN INTERESTING ONE!"

After discussing several points related to the main topic of "A Nest of Wood Ducks," Dr. Hensen directed the students to outline the story to the "degree of a first grader's conception." He asked them to focus on the main ideas and important details that would be developmentally
appropriate for a first grader. Dr. Hensen told his students they would have twenty-five minutes to do the outline and to generate questions related to it. He informed them that pages 170 and 171 in their text provided a model for writing expository text questions they could follow if they wished. Again, he reiterated that this was "real teaching stuff."

Dr. Hensen told the students they could work on the task in another room if they wished, but were to be back by 2:35 p.m. at the latest. Seventeen students remained in the room. The rest formed groups in another classroom across the hall. Dr. Hensen left the room to meet with them for a brief time. He then returned and sat down at the teacher desk. A student asked Dr. Hensen if the tasks they were working on would lead into the analysis project. He answered that it would and that it would also lead to the portfolio task. He sat at the desk and read about seven minutes. (I do not know what he was reading because the materials were laying flat on the desk and I was too far away to see). He then got up and went from group to group. He asked each group if they had any questions and how things were going.

About twenty-four minutes into the work session, Dr. Hensen told the students that when they completed the task, they should check their questions by asking themselves whether a child in first grade could answer
their questions without reading the story. Four minutes later he initiated a class discussion on the difference between writing questions for expository text and narrative text. The discussion continued for about seven minutes. Throughout the discussion, Dr. Hensen reiterated and supported the students' responses. At the close of the discussion, he summarized the key points of the task. These included:

1. In narrative text there is a basic schema for stories (setting, problem or initiating event, internal reaction, action and consequences).
2. Expository text depends on the author's purpose and what the teacher and students think is important. Expository text should be outlined prior to generating questions and assessing student performance.
3. Teachers need to know the appropriateness of text for students.
4. The guiding question, do my questions represent reasonably important material, can be helpful when developing questions to assess comprehension.

Near the end of the summary Dr. Hensen informed the students that he wanted them to field test the questions they generated for the narrative and expository texts. He also clarified field assignment number six on the handout. The assignment was type written at the bottom of the class handout, nonetheless he went over the
assignment orally with his students. He explained:

One of the reasons I put a first grade person in each group is to go do this with some first graders this week ....

Now, I don't know how much you will be able to do, but each first and second grade person in there [in each group], the way that I have this designed all right is that maybe you might be able to do one one week and one the next week. Because what I'd like to do is this. I would like you to use the questions that your group generated, tape all this all right. And then bring the tape to class next week. And somebody in your group commit, no two people in your group commit to bringing a tape recorder okay. Bring a tape recorder to class in these groups that you're in all right. But what I'd actually like you to do is to actually get a kid to read this, the narrative passage and then answer the questions that you generated and see what they say, all right. And then, not for you to analyze that, but to bring the tape back to your group and your group will look at it together or, no listen to it together and check out your questions. Are these good questions to ask first graders or second graders? Golly how did they respond out (?), I never expected that etc. So they give you some feedback on that okay. Is it
too much to ask that you do the expository also? Dr. Hensen later told the students that he would just take the narrative if they thought it was too much to do both.

Some discussion and clarification followed his explanation of the field assignment. Dr. Hensen told the students they could approach the task any way they could work it out. Also, he suggested it would be nice if they could get some children to do a retelling of the story, but not to worry about it if they could not work it in. The retellings would enable his students to compare the content relative to what the children retold to the content covered by the questions they had generated in class.

Dr. Hensen finalized the field assignment by restating that each group needed to have a "kid(s)" read a narrative passage, an expository passage, do a retelling for each, and answer questions for each. He provided some specific guidelines regarding the retellings. He told the students they could only make comments like, "Tell me about what you read", "Can you tell me any more?", or they could restate what the child had said and take it from there. For example, they could say to the child something like, "You mentioned that the owl was unhappy. Could you tell me more about that?" But they could not ask questions to prompt that the reader had not already entered into
the discussion.

The assignment just discussed was directed at students who were working in the first and second grades. Dr. Hensen had also designed an assignment for the students working in the upper grades. This too was typed at the bottom of the class handout (see Appendix O). Dr. Hensen explained that these student teachers should select a passage for their students to either listen to or read (orally or silently). Once this was done, the child was to retell the story. These retellings were to be audio taped and brought to class next week with some copies of the text that was used.

Following the directions for all of the field assignments, Dr. Hensen allowed some time for the students to get together in their groups to "work out the details" and ask him any questions they might have. At this time, some students began gathering their materials preparing to leave, others talked with one another about the task, while a few talked with Dr. Hensen about the assignment. Gradually, the students dispersed.

Dr. Hensen had scheduled a meeting with some students following today's class, so our regular debriefing session was postponed.

Debriefing 4

Due to the scheduled meeting that Dr. Hensen had with some students following class, we talked about the
class during our planning session on the following Saturday.

11:56 a.m. - 12:04 p.m., Thoughts on Monday's Class

Dr. Hensen informed me that he got a late start on what he had planned for the last class because of the model matters that surfaced. He said he had intended to get started on "his stuff" right away but was "captured" by "where they [the students] were" as class began. Even though the model matters lingered for some time, Dr. Hensen stated that he was glad he took the time to address them because such matters are important to the students. He also said that he could have probably done without the warm up activity on comprehension, but was glad he did it too because the activity got the students thinking about comprehension. He said he would have liked for the activity to have been focused a little differently, but the room did not lend itself much to the activity. He also wanted to bring out what the students really talked about during the warm up activity, but time was limited. So, he reasoned that he had to be satisfied with the idea that maybe something worthwhile went on when the students shared their three statements about comprehension with their partners. He also stated that he believed the activity served as an "activator" for the students' thinking.

Dr. Hensen said he was not sure how well he set the
context for the students in class. However, he noted that once the students got into writing the questions that they kind of quickly built the context for themselves. He said he felt good about what the students got from the task once they got into it. According to Dr. Hensen, it looked like the students were engaged in the task and a lot of discussion was going on in the groups. But the task was not over. He stated that a good test for what the students got from class interactions would be to go to the field and have children respond to the questions that they had generated in class.

I shared with Dr. Hensen that there were some students sitting next to me who commented that they were not used to breaking a story down and thinking of it in the sense that these tasks required of them. He said he was glad I shared that with him because he got that feeling as they worked on the tasks. I also pointed out that I thought the questions in the course text were very helpful to the students as they worked on the tasks. Dr. Hensen agreed. He told me that he ran across those in the morning while he was reviewing for class and thought he could have the students use them. However, he did not want the students to use those questions at the start of the task, so he waited until they were more into the task before he pointed out the page numbers that would be helpful.
Dr. Hensen summed up his debriefing by saying that he would like to do this task a little more systematically in the future. Throughout the session, he wrote some notes to himself for future reference. He stated that he was anxious to see what his students would bring to class from the field assignment. He explained that he was worried about what they would get while doing the field assignment and whether or not they would bring the tape recorders that he asked them to bring. He said he has struggled with getting students to bring in such technology and samples of their students' work many times in the past. He said he would bring as many recorders as he could get his hands on to class Monday. If six students would bring in tape recorders in addition to those he brought, he would be all right.
Planning Session 7

Dr. Hensen and I met on Saturday morning, February 23, 1991 for our seventh and final planning session. The session started at 8:00 a.m. and ended about 10:14 a.m.

8:00 - 8:30 a.m., Beginning the Session

As was our pattern, Dr. Hensen and I walked to the nearby 7-Eleven to get coffee before starting the planning discussions. When we returned we reviewed several issues from earlier discussions and considered the procedures of this study.

First, we discussed a set of questions I had worked on since our last planning session. The purpose for developing those questions was to get feedback from the students so I could gain a better idea of their perception of the course. I shared a copy of the questions with Dr. Hensen and asked him if he had any ideas he would like to add. I was particularly interested in establishing questions that would allow the students to elaborate their responses.

Dr. Hensen directed my attention to the "Reading Class Task Evaluation" form that he shared with me during our first planning session. At first I did not remember the form. I looked through my materials and found the copy he had given me. The form contained a list of several topics which the students were to respond to by writing
what they considered to be pluses (P), minuses (M), and interesting points (I) about each listed topic. Dr. Hensen referred to the form as the "PMI form." The topics listed on the form included: Field Assignments; Tests and Text; Group Project; Problem Solving; and Other. Dr. Hensen read some of the comments the students wrote on the PMI evaluation form for last semester's course. He suggested that I consider using such a form in conjunction with the questions I had in mind for the students. Based on the examples he read, I liked the PMI form. It would provide students with opportunities to respond in a variety of ways. I could use the form to generate a comprehensive representation of the course content and at the same time allow for open ended responses. I told Dr. Hensen that I might put the PMI on one side of a sheet of paper and list a few open ended questions on the other side. Next, we discussed the major tasks of the course that should be represented on the evaluation form. The tasks included: case study, field assignments, lesson task analysis, classwork, thinking about students (observations and judgments), and portfolio. These were the major tasks the students had worked on during the semester. Dr. Hensen said he would incorporate the final form I came up with into his course evaluation. He pointed out that the direction in which I was headed with the development of the form was more than he would have done for getting
feedback on the course. I then became concerned that it may be too much. Dr. Hensen assured me that it was not. He said, "It is a lot, but I do not feel like it is too much." He said he would provide some class time for the students to complete the form.

Next, for about three minutes, we discussed the possibility of my setting up some interviews with three or four of the students. I wanted to gain a better understanding of how students perceived the course and thought an interview would be informative. Dr. Hensen stated that he would like to have such data because the results would be different than if he interviewed the students. He said if he interviewed the students, they would tell him what he wanted to hear. I suggested that we have a sign up sheet for the students who were interested in participating. From the responses we could select three or four students for a thirty to forty minute interview each. Dr. Hensen said he would help select the students since he was familiar with their interests and backgrounds. I wanted to include students who might have different views on the course, if possible. For example, I wanted to include a student who would represent a conservative viewpoint, one who would represent a liberal viewpoint, and one in between.

I raised the issue of whether to use Dr. Hensen's real name in the report of this research. I informed
him that I had used his actual name when writing the proposal for this study, but I was concerned as to whether or not I should continue using his real name. He said that he would prefer another name be used in the final document. Sipping his coffee from time to time, he talked about his views on this issue for four and a half minutes. He explained how difficult it can be to reveal one's work, even as an experienced professor. He said:

... I think I have watched faculty members do it, and some of the things that they struggle with the most when you are going up for promotion in tenure is you have to write, well in essence an intellectual autobiography. It was extremely difficult for me to write, extremely difficult to talk about myself in print. A lot of people have that [difficulty].

Next, I invited Dr. Hensen to attend my prospectus exam. He thanked me for the invitation, but declined because "there was work yet to be done " and besides, he would be out of town. He said he would be more comfortable not knowing my thoughts about the study.

8:30 - 8:38 a.m., Reflections on Last Monday's Class

Dr. Hensen directed our attention to some things that he had wanted to accomplish during class last Monday, but was unable to do. First, he said he did not do the task reaction sheet that he discussed at our last planning session. The omission was due to an oversight when he
reviewed the plans for that class session. While reviewing the plans for the class, he explained that he must have skipped the pages in his notes where he had recorded what he wanted to do. He wanted students to answer the following questions about the task they had done as a field assignment:

1. Why did I select the task?
2. What problems did I encounter?
3. How do I feel about it at this point?
4. What did I learn from this task?

Dr. Hensen said he was upset that he did not have them do the task reaction sheet which would have brought the lesson on task analysis together more. To rectify this situation, he said he would have students do some kind of free write at the beginning of the next class. He began writing some notes in a notebook as he talked through his ideas:

Okay, so 2/25 class, all right, (pause) get them to do a free write. (Long pause) So what kind of stem do I want? Five minutes free write on analyzing classroom instructional tasks, that is all I want to say, I think. I do not want to form it. That may give us some nice information too about where they are.

Also in reference to the last class, Dr. Hensen informed me that even though he had a comparison task
all ready to go, he chose not to use it. That task, described to me in our last planning session, would have required the students to compare the questions they generated for the stories "Strange Bumps" and "A Nest of Wood Ducks" with the questions in the basal text. Dr. Hensen said he "just did not have enough time" to do that task in class. However, he said he was very pleased with the discussion they had about generating questions for narrative and expository texts.

8:38 - 8:57 a.m., Issues of Grading as Part of a Portfolio

Dr. Hensen next examined some possibilities for developing a portfolio task. The portfolio task was a new task for his course. He began structuring the task by thinking out loud about what he wanted the students to do with the task. One idea he generated was for the students to describe the system that is used to monitor student work in their classrooms. Each student could interview his/her cooperating teacher to find out how s/he derives grades and keeps track of school work. Dr. Hensen said he could put the students in grade level groups to generate a list of the kinds of grading procedures that are done. In his view, one important component of a portfolio for the students to consider was a description of a grading procedure used by a classroom teacher. He wanted the description to include an explanation of what is graded and how it is graded.
Dr. Hensen asked me what subjects appear on a reportcard that require a grade. I described the contents of a reportcard I was familiar with. He decided that for a major part of the portfolio task, he would ask the students to focus on what was graded in reading and English (language arts). The students could include additional areas such as spelling if they wished. Dr. Hensen then briefly talked about some issues relative to whole language and spelling. He explained that the purpose of the grade level groups was to get students to examine what teachers are paying attention to as they conduct formative and summative evaluation. He said he might have the students synthesize the information from their group work onto a sheet and share their results with the whole class.

Dr. Hensen expressed concern about the amount of diversity which would surface in this activity with regard to grading. I assured him that the discussions would reveal a good amount of diversity. I told him that I had done a similar activity on grading with some undergraduate students which brought out quite a bit of diversity. My students and I found that teachers vary greatly in how they determine grades, even teachers working within the same guidelines. There is also considerable difference between how grades are determined in the lower grades and the upper grades.

I explained that in my own teaching experience, I
experimented with many different grading procedures through the years. I discussed several including a percentage scale (95-100=A, 88-94=B, ... below 75=F), contracts, and a point system. The particular subject(s) that I was teaching at the time influenced the procedure I used. I shared a grading system that I developed as a result of experimenting with alternative approaches. For example, the school system in which I taught used a five point percentage grading scale. The more I worked with that system, and the more I explored the issue of grading, the less satisfied I was with it. So, I began thinking intently about how I could develop what I considered a fairer system of grading. I experimented each year for several years with different systems. I finally developed one that I liked. I used the county scale because it was required, but I altered it somewhat. The lowest grade that I would record in my grade book was a 50. If the student actually made a grade lower that 50 I indicated it in my grade book by putting a minus beside the 50. From this I could determine if there was a consistent pattern of low scores. I discovered that the final grades balanced out to a fair representation of the students' performance. I did not see why grades like 10's, and 20's should be allowed to pull a child's grade down to where s/he could not get it back up within a grade period, particularly at the elementary level. I believe that
learning is developmental and that if children are having extreme difficulty, they are not ready for the tasks they are being asked to do. Alternative instruction should be considered. Personally, I do not think a child in the elementary school should receive an F on his/her reportcard unless s/he simply does nothing. You can always supplement the grade on a reportcard with a note informing parents that their child is having difficulty with the grade level materials. It can be indicated that the grade is reflective of the progress the child is making. If a child is simply doing nothing, then the teacher should look into what may be influencing such behavior and seek additional help for the child from other services available.

Dr. Hensen termed what I had been talking about as "strategic compliance." He told me that I was "accounting for the skewdness of the system." He said he had never heard of using that particular grading approach before. I liked the term strategic compliance and have since used it in discussions about grading.

Dr. Hensen told me that the grades for his students in this course would be "really wild." He said that of all the courses that he has taught, he cared less about grades in this course. He explained that if students do the work required in the course, they will get high grades. As example of his grading he talked about the
case studies that the students had turned in so far. He said there were a couple of B+'s, mostly A-'s, and the ones he thought were really good got an A. Dr. Hensen said the high grades were reflective of the students' really thinking about the case studies. He said he would rather have students hand a paper in late if they really thought about it and learned something from it, than to hand it in on the due date. He runs this course to provide this sort of leeway, while maintaining set due dates for students who prefer traditional structure. For example, Dr. Hensen told me that one of the students came to him a week before and asked for direction. She asserted, "Now Dr. (Hensen) tell me that if I don't have my case study in by Monday that I am going to get an F, will you please."

Dr. Hensen said that my conversations about grading were helpful to him because he had no idea how teachers in the elementary schools arrived at their grades in reading and English. He said, "It's been a great mystery to me."

Getting back to how Dr. Hensen could have students work on the portfolio task, he said he could use three different colored cards or stickums on which the students could record what they or their cooperating teacher look at when grading, how they look at it, and the procedures they use to determine grades. This could also include
how much they examine. Then as a follow up the students could tape the cards on a large sheet of paper as they discuss their information.

Another way Dr. Hensen said he could have the students look at the issue of grading would be to just let them share all of those things in a large group discussion. I pointed out that this task might lead the students to sit down with their cooperating teachers, if they had not already done so, to talk about grading. Dr. Hensen said he needed a "sharing strategy." Thus he talked about some possibilities. In a circle each student would share what his/her cooperating teacher does relative to grading. Each group would record its discussion on a summary sheet, and then report back to the class as a whole. He reflected that this approach to sharing might be better than using the cards or stickums because it would take less time. He stated that this would be the monitoring part of the task.

8:57 – 9:29 a.m., Focusing on the Portfolio Task

Thinking out loud about the portfolio task, Dr. Hensen said, "We want to know what it is." He looked for an article, "Assessment Accountability and the Whole Language Curriculum" among several articles he had in a stack. Once he found it, he began reading a section out loud. He reported that the article focused on a whole literacy environment in which portfolios were used. After reading
briefly, he said he needed to get an article by Wolf from Educational Leadership. He said that perhaps we could go to the library after our session to get it. He read a little more from the article and noted that it described five major assessment tasks and procedures. Then he said:

You know one of the things I could do, for this task, is make this a group task, with an individual paper. He said that the students could have a grade level portfolio, K, 1st, 2nd, etc., but he was concerned about how he could accommodate the students who were working in the middle school, those teaching science and math. He said:

I don't [know] what ... to do with the science people. I guess they could work with a person in language arts in the middle school with what's a language arts portfolio. So they could team with those people. ... so I could have a middle school bunch that works together.

Dr. Hensen continued to explore the assessment accountability article. He said this would be a nice article to use with students because it was short and easy to understand. The article addressed five major assessment tasks and procedures: a response to literature, analysis of students' writing, a running record, a voluntary reading log, and a profile sheet. Of these, Dr. Hensen said that the students had not been involved
in analyzing a child's writing in his course. He said, "That has been a missing piece in this course and I will put it in next year." He was thinking of ways to connect the content of this article with what the students were doing. Using the field assignment from last week, he said the students could construct a portfolio for their three students (the students selected in the field assignment). He stated that he was in a dilemma as to how to approach the task with the students. Because he thought the task was difficult, he wanted the students to have some "group support." He said he could have them brainstorm in a group to develop the notion of what a portfolio is. However, he worried about the time that would be necessary for group work of this sort, especially when the semester was nearing its end. Nevertheless, he decided to use group work to get the students started. He also noted that making the task a group endeavor could, in some ways, make it an even more difficult task. He said this prospect made him a "little worried."

Focusing the task further, Dr. Hensen said he wanted to give students two or three good pieces (articles) on the notion of portfolio. They would use the information from the articles to help them decide what is, or should be, in a portfolio and how the information gathered in a portfolio could be used. Once the students conceptualized what a portfolio is, they would construct
a portfolio for the three children they had selected in the field assignment. Dr. Hensen realized that they may not be able to understand and remember all the information presented in the articles, but believed they could get some. He said he would ask the students to get what they could, if possible an example of each. He emphasized that this task was not "a case study type thing."

Dr. Hensen then picked up The Whole Language Evaluation Book (Goodman, Goodman, & Hood, 1989) to see if there was anything in there the students might use. He read some excerpts orally from this text and considered whether he could use the selection in some way. For example, he said there was a pretty good selection in the book on evaluating the conventions of writing. However, he explained he could not use this selection at this time because the evaluation of a child's writing runs over a year. The students simply did not have time to do something like that this late in the semester. He did note, however, that he wanted to keep this idea in mind for next year. It would fit with his idea of having students develop a portfolio over the entire course time.

He then examined another selection in The Whole Language Evaluation Book. He pointed out that the teacher in the selection was developing her own system. He particularly liked one passage because it would "provide
a little more context." Then he realized that the description was about a learning disabilities teacher, so it would not fit what he had in mind. I then asked Dr. Hensen:

So what you are trying to do right now is develop a task that will show them what a portfolio is, what it is made up of, and that kind of thing?

He responded:

Umhum, yeah, what it is, how to use it, you know the notion over time kind of thing, which we don't have of course.

Dr. Hensen then stated that he had the first task done, the monitoring part. He said the second task would rely on two articles on portfolios, the Au article and the Wolf article.

Dr. Hensen reiterated that he wanted students to determine what a portfolio is like by working together in a group. He speculated that it would take students about fifteen minutes to read the articles. He feared that he could be designing a task that would "get in their way." He said that asking them what a portfolio is, could lead to a procedural thing. However, he wanted the task to be more generative. He thought out loud:

I could just give them a task, if you were building a portfolio for a grade X, what would you put in it and why?
He said students could get support from the group by brainstorming first, what they would put in a portfolio and why. Second, they would design a portfolio for a particular grade level. Third, the students would field test the portfolio they developed using the children they had selected in a previous field assignment. Finally, they would evaluate the portfolio based on their field test.

Dr. Hensen repeated the ideas he just went over, then asked himself, "Is this too complex for them?" He reiterated that the students would use the two articles and their own thinking to determine what a portfolio is. Then they would design a portfolio using the group to help if they wished, or they could do it on their own. Next they would field test parts of their portfolio, using the students they selected. The purpose of the field test was to help his students see the overall quality and usefulness of their portfolio (the strengths and weaknesses). Dr. Hensen said the students would also focus on how to manage portfolio use in the classroom. They would also consider how the portfolio could be used to communicate to parents, teachers, and students.

As Dr. Hensen generated ideas for the portfolio task, he repeated them several times, each time adding something new to idea or recognizing a piece that was missing. He noted that portfolios are qualitative in nature and
that they emphasize process and growth. As he developed the task, Dr. Hensen stated that he liked it, but did not know if there would be enough time for his students to do it. The course was a twelve week course, and time was drawing nigh. He said the students would be a little upset because they would not like the extension of time that would be required to get the task done. Yet, he said that students usually take extensions to get assignments done anyway. Dr. Hensen said he could tolerate the students' dislike of the additional requirement. He would help them by building in a support time in the next class. That is, he would provide some class time for the students to get some of the work done. The task would run over two class periods and a week following that, making the task due at the end of March, just before spring break.

I told Dr. Hensen that I felt a task like this portfolio task would be a good application of the kinds of things they had been studying. Also, it was a good time for the students to work on such a task because the work with the portfolios could be done while they were in school for student teaching. Dr. Hensen said that the key was to build the portfolio from what they were doing in the classroom ("their stuff").

Dr. Hensen restated the steps of the task again, this time adding that he could give the students a choice
of compressing the assignment or extending it. He noted that some students could get the assignment done in a week, if they had the right situation. Regardless, Dr. Hensen told me that he wanted the assignment to be real. He said that next year he would start the portfolio task in the foundations course during the first semester of their field experience. Rescheduling the task in this way, he explained, would allow next year's group to have a more adequate task completion schedule.

9:29 - 9:31 a.m., Students' Analysis of Their Work

Next, Dr. Hensen assessed how the students analyze their work. He informed me, for example, that when students do a case study, they first describe the child's characteristics (some non academic characteristics and some academic characteristics) in general terms. He said:

Very little of their work do they analyze qualitatively at all. They analyze it primarily quantitatively, the kid got A, B, C. They don't move to the next level, which is, ...what this is all about.

9:31 - 9:34 a.m., Connecting the Two Courses

Thinking again about connecting the foundations and assessment courses during the next academic year, Dr. Hensen noted that he would have to include strategies in addition to quantitative and qualitative assessment. He noted that Gillet and Temple (1990) would be helpful
in providing such strategies. He said he would have students focus on process, growth, and qualitative assessment which would be ongoing. He concluded that he liked the way the portfolio task was ending up. It reflected questions teachers are currently asking about assessment. Dr. Hensen reported that as a result of his courses, students leave with mental processes that will help them in future decision making.

9:34 - 9:38 a.m., Task Environment

I told Dr. Hensen that I wondered whether the students would include the classroom environment when they selected considerations for their portfolios. He asked me to "say a little bit more about that." I elaborated with an example of how I used to have my students write a snow poem the first day it snowed, instead of just having them write one on a cold day. I explained that, when it is snowing outside, it is easier to get the children excited about writing a snow poem. Other examples I used to illustrate what I meant by picking up on the context were: a child could have experienced a recent death in the family, the child could have missed preliminary instruction due to an illness, or the child could have just lost a pet. I explained that teachers should note such occurrences because they affect how a child performs on a task. Dr. Hensen said, "I understand now, yeah. Yeah, that task environment. That is a real good point. I
don't have that anywhere."

9:38 – 9:43 a.m., Time Frame for Portfolio Task

Dr. Hensen reconsidered the time frame for completing the portfolio task. He said he would give his students a firm deadline of March 22nd to get the task done. He began contemplating how to work in the course evaluation plan we had made earlier. According to Dr. Hensen, as a general rule he never conducts class evaluations until final exams are completed. He explained that he believes it is important to evaluate all parts of the course.

9:43 – 10:03 a.m., Ending the Session

Dr. Hensen said he felt he really planned two classes in today's planning session. He summarized today's session and how he would have students share last week's field assignment. He restated his concern that student teachers in middle school placements might have difficulty with the portfolio task. He explained that they may have to work as one group. He anticipated confronting some problems with students who were working in the fourth and fifth grades because some of those grades were departmentalized. He worried that this could end up being a hard task because of such situations. However, he said if the students solve the portfolio task in any way, shape, or form, he will give them an A. Dr. Hensen explained that he would just let them work it out and he would deal with each issue as it came up. He concluded that for
the majority of the students, the task would work. He said he would sit in front of his McIntosh tomorrow and put in the details to make it all come together. At the close of our session, I asked Dr. Hensen a few questions about my dissertation and the release form that would be needed for this study.

Immediately following our conversations, Dr. Hensen and I walked to the library on campus to find and copy the Au and Wolf articles.
Class Meeting 7

This class took place on February 25, 1991 at 12:00 p.m. and ended at 3:02 p.m. Immediately following the class Dr. Hensen and I met for the debriefing session for about twenty-one minutes.

12:00 – 12:13 p.m., Beginning the Class

For the first five minutes of class the students talked among themselves as Dr. Hensen prepared for class and collected some papers from the students. Dr. Hensen, wearing dark blue pants, a white and blue striped shirt, and a dark blue tie with white dots, began class in room 210 at Mayfield. The students were seated in rows facing the front of the room. Dr. Hensen collected some case studies from the students and immediately asked them to do a free write for five minutes, about any comments or reactions they had on analyzing classroom instructional tasks. While the students were writing, he sorted some papers on the teacher desk at the front of the room, looked at a wall map for a short time, and erased a chalkboard. He then picked up a copy of each handout for that day's class and walked to the back of the room where I was seated. He handed me a copy of each handout. They were entitled: "Monitoring Task Record Sheet," "Building a Portfolio Task," and "Portfolio Response Sheet." (Appendix P).

After the students had written for about seven
minutes, Dr. Hensen collected the students' written work. He told the students that they did not have to put their names on these papers. He pointed out that this type of activity (a free write) was a good activity to use with students at the beginning of a class because it gets students settled down and focused. He told them they might want to put this idea of a "focus task" in their teaching repertoire. Dr. Hensen pointed out that there are other activities they could use with their students in lieu of a free write that would have the same settling effect. He suggested they could have their students brainstorm; think about a topic or term for thirty seconds; or list five things to get them settled and focused.

12:13 - 12:20 p.m., Introducing the Monitoring Task Record Sheet

Dr. Hensen handed a stack of "Monitoring Task Record Sheets" to a student near him and asked her to pass them around. As the sheets were being distributed, Dr. Hensen explained the task. He reminded the students that the field assignment last week was designed to help them get some idea of how their students were graded. Today's first task would allow them to share what they learned with their classmates by grade level groups.
He explained that the handout consisted of two questions to guide their group discussions:

1) What student work is graded in reading and in language arts (any work that the teacher responds to is graded)?

2) How do teachers obtain report card grades for reading and language arts?

He said there could be other questions, but these were to get them thinking. He told the students that grading was an issue that often stumps beginning teachers. He said it was probably one of the highest risk things they would face in the first few weeks, except Back to School Night. Grades are the first public statement to parents that they will make about learning in their classroom. Therefore, the next two weeks would be spent examining and creating an assessment system which "informs people." He told the students that perhaps the forethought from the activities they do in class would be of benefit to them when they enter the classroom as beginning teachers having to make grading decisions.

Next, Dr. Hensen clarified what he meant by grades. He said:

When I say grade, and teacher grades a paper, anytime you look at it and you put some kind of indication on it, that's a grade to me. I don't care what symbol you are using; a check, a star, a smily face. When
you put something on a paper, you have graded it. When ... you have made some kind of judgment about the child's work, ... you have in essence graded the paper.

So Dr. Hensen defined grading for his students in a robust sense.

One student asked whether they should discuss only how their supervising teacher arrived at grades, or were they to also include how they graded papers. Dr. Hensen said he assumed that most of them would be using their cooperating teacher's system. However, he told them that they definitely could include their own ideas and, if they differed from their cooperating teacher's, that was fine. The purpose of the task was for them to get together in groups to "see the variety of things that people pay attention to" when assessing student performance.

Dr. Hensen asked the students were to divide into groups. He directed different grade level groups to different areas of the room. He asked each group to select a recorder and a reporter so they could later share their discussions with the class as a whole.

12:20 - 12:53 p.m., Students Working on the Task

The students divided into the groups according to the grade levels Dr. Hensen designated. The third and fourth grade groups were small, so he asked them to work
as a single group. Dr. Hensen went from group to group as they worked on the task. About twenty-five minutes into the task, Dr. Hensen asked the students to get ready to put their chairs back into rows for the next class that would use the room. He told his class they would reform at 1:00 p.m. in the grade level groups that they were working in. The students continued working for about seven and a half minutes before dispersing.

12:53 - 1:00 p.m., Break

1:00 - 1:56 p.m., Follow Up on Monitoring Task

When the students reconvened in Room 208, Dr. Hensen led a rather lengthy large group discussion. He initiated discussion by telling the class that he would like to get some sense from each group about the kind of conversations they had. He advised them not to elaborate too much at this point. He provided each grade level group an opportunity to comment.

The second grade group reported first. They divided their discussion on grading into three categories: actual grades, comments only, and nothing (no response on student's work). Actual grades were kept on things like permanent files (percentile rankings), workbook pages, homework folders, spelling and dictation tests, and English (tests and workbook pages). Comments were written on workbook pages, creative writing, handwriting, and skills practice sheets. Certain items were read by the
cooperating teacher but were not graded or commented on. These included work in journals, filed work, word boxes, student made class books, computer unit tests, creative writing, and file folder activities.

Following this presentation Dr. Hensen asked the class if they had any questions for that group. One student asked, "What kind of comments do you all use?" One group member elaborated that it was different for everybody. "Some people get checks, check pluses. Some people get actual like Super, Good Job. Some people actually get specific comments for example capitalization, 'make sure you capitalize the sentence'."

The first grade group reported that they graded 1) workbook and skills practice sheets, 2) creative writing, 3) questions on oral reading, and 4) participation. Most of this grading is done as the teacher walks around the room and monitors the students' work. The teacher places checks or smily faces on the students' papers as s/he goes around the room. One student reported that her cooperating teacher grades a lot, but it seems that the report card grades are determined subjectively. For example, her teacher edits students' writing for punctuation, capitalization, and content but does not keep a running average of grades. She may say a kid is doing B work on tasks in class which is supported by B participation, but she does not average grades to get
the report card grades.

Dr. Hensen summarized that what this teacher was doing was making a holistic judgment. Students agreed with him. Dr. Hensen then asked the class if there were any questions they would like to ask the first grade group. Receiving no questions, he asked, "Where is our third grade group?"

The third grade group focused on the kinds of grading done in the area of reading, spelling, and English. Grades are assigned to teacher made tests on stories, basal unit tests on stories, workbook pages, comprehension quizzes, and oral questioning. Additionally, they discovered that their teachers graded any kind of writing that their students did (journals, spelling tests, workbook pages, English assignments) in addition to the content of those areas. Especially English, which received number and letter grades on book tests. Dr. Hensen asked for clarification as to whether a number grade or letter grade was used. One of the group members responded that they used both.

This reply led to a discussion of the school division policies on grading. (The whole class was now participating instead of by group.) According to the students, the policy stated that the teachers were not allowed to put number grades on the students' papers. Another student clarified that you could record the
numerical score in the teacher grade book, but you could not put that score on a student's paper. As the students discussed this issue, it became apparent that there were quite a few different assessments of the policy. Other issues emerged, such as whether partial credit should be given to student work.

Dr. Hensen led the students back to a focus by pointing out that teachers are given some freedom to set criteria and that criteria is influenced by many factors. Sometimes teachers establish such criteria on their own, sometimes in collaboration with colleagues, sometimes with student input, sometimes criteria are text driven, and sometimes they are constructive.

Later in the discussion, one student commented that her teacher marked her students down so they would put forth more effort in future assignments. Dr. Hensen responded:

That is a testable question. Is it indeed marking them down for that that causes them to pay more attention or does it give them a lower grade in that subject, and they begin to lose motivation in it? He went on to explain that if a student does not bring in his homework, he may get a zero. If this zero is averaged in with a score of 100, the average is 50, which is failing. But, he said, if you average a F and with an A, you get a C. Dr. Hensen said that teachers often
use zeros to "boss" middle school kids around. After continued discussion on the kinds of grading procedures the students were experiencing in the classroom, Dr. Hensen asked them if any of them gave effort grades. They discussed this briefly and explained a few ways in which they had. In response to their comments, Dr. Hensen said, "This is so complex. What do you value and what is fair?" Later he told his students that they have to build into their grading system the fact that students are human. He said:

   It just blows my mind when we set up these inflexible systems that ask more of children than we ask of adults in college classrooms .... One of the things we do when we set up these administrative systems is we forget that they are there to serve children and to make sure that children learn. ... Does our system point to helping children learn? Do my actions help children learn or feel good about themselves so they will continue learning? I think you have to look at that.

Next a student working in the fourth grade explained how her cooperating teacher graded homework. Her remarks prompted an eight minute discussion about grading homework. Dr. Hensen responded intermittently. He advised the students on several points regarding the grading of homework. He said they have to consider the issue of
accountability when grading, things like being too strict or too lenient. They need to ask themselves whether they have a system that fosters child responsibility. Additionally, the quality of the homework must be considered, is it a meaningful task to begin with. When a teacher continually gets inconsistent behavior from his/her students, it could be due to the task system. Dr. Hensen reminded the students of what they had learned last semester from Duffy and Roehler. He summarized:

Kids pay attention to what teachers say is important, whether it is a comment or whether it is a grade. You see the reward system is what tells kids what is important in your classroom, both explicitly in terms of content, and affectively, in terms of what you as a teacher value.

One student raised the issue of grading in the junior high school. She asked if there was a reward system other than grades in the junior high setting. The students working in the junior high explained a school wide system that was created and supported by the PTA. In that system, students could select a reward from a list if their grades had improved. Even though this served as a motivator for many students, it was still based on grades. A student working in a fifth grade shared that her cooperating teacher used food as a reward. She explained:

One of the reasons why we have to use external rewards
is because most of this stuff, a good share of this stuff that we ask kids to do, is not worth their attention. That is why we must force them to do it. ... When you get kids to do authentic tasks, tasks that makes sense to them, you don't have to reward them with anything, do you.

Dr. Hensen then shared the reinforcement system used at the reading clinic at the university. He told the students that the system allowed children to record their own work. Although such a system is heavily behavioral, it allowed each child to see his/her success, something we all like to see. Dr. Hensen reemphasized that "nothing can substitute for a kid achieving on a meaningful task."

The discussion on grading continued for another five minutes. During that time one student brought up the issue of cheating. Dr. Hensen and his students discussed cheating for about three and a half minutes.

Dr. Hensen next led the discussion back to the group presentations. He said that he wanted to give everyone a chance to share their group work. The grading discussion continued for another ten minutes. During that time the students and Dr. Hensen discussed issues related to grading, but the groups per se did not present as they did earlier in the class session. Whenever a student brought up a topic, Dr. Hensen elaborated on the idea. They discussed issues like teacher judgment in grading,
assessment means in kindergarten, establishing credibility as a teacher, establishing criteria for grading, and community influences on grading. Also during the discussion Dr. Hensen emphasized the importance of being reflective about the quality of the tasks that students are required to do, as well as the reward system that is used. He informed the students that teachers heavily concentrate on quantitative measurement because that is what society wants. However, he said that assessment was moving more in the direction of qualitative work, where the emphasis is more on process and progress, with a focus on learning meaningful things.

1:56 - 2:58 p.m., Building A Portfolio Task

Dr. Hensen asked the students to come to the front of the room to pick up a copy of "Building a Portfolio Task," a copy of the "Portfolio Response Sheet," and a copy of each article. He explained that this would give them a slight break and let them stretch their legs. As the students were getting the handouts, Dr. Hensen collected the information they recorded during the previous activity. He told the students that in the previous discussions on grading he had shared his answers. He encouraged them to listen to other peoples' opinions and make up their own minds.

Dr. Hensen began the portfolio task by presenting an overview of the task. He told the students that they
would use two articles and a concept development sheet to learn about portfolios. They would develop a conception of what a portfolio is in class. They would follow up the class activities with a field assignment requiring them to develop a portfolio which would be due the next class session. He explained that they would also field test their portfolio as much as possible. He told the students that they did not have to have everything in their portfolios that was discussed in class. They would probably only be able to field test some of the portfolio materials.

Dr. Hensen informed the students that at the completion of the field assignment, they should be able to evaluate their use of portfolio by writing a response relative to what they discovered. He emphasized that the students should have a first draft of a portfolio for their grade level for next week's class. They could then get some feedback from the group relative to improving their portfolio, if they wished. He explained that he would like for them to have all of the work outlined on the handout completed no later than March 22nd. He said, "I am going to set a deadline date on this one, March 22." Teasingly, he said he would take off fifty percent each day it was late. He said, "You could end up minus 200 for this. Then I'd have to use teacher judgment a little bit." He gave them the option of turning the task
in early, if they completed it ahead of time.

Next, Dr. Hensen told the students they were going to work on the task for about forty-five minutes to develop a conception of what a portfolio is. He directed them to skim the Wolf and Au articles. Then as a group try the concept development task.

The students worked on the task in their groups for about thirty-four minutes. Intermittently, Dr. Hensen made comments about the task to the whole class. For example, he said, "I would skim these articles. I would not pour through them like you would memorize them for a test. Skim them to get the general [idea]." Seventeen minutes into the task, Dr. Hensen asked the students to talk for about five minutes with members of their group about what a portfolio is. Thirteen minutes later he said, "Okay, about a minute, about a minute." Four minutes passed and he then asked the class to "come back together."

Dr. Hensen informed the students that the task they were working on was a "professional task", an "authentic task" that would help them next year in their teaching. He told them the task was based on what he thought they would be facing as teachers. He went on to elaborate about the direction education must move, if the field is to overcome the kinds of issues the students discussed earlier in the class. He challenged the students to change the task systems in their classrooms to address the issues
they raised earlier. Dr. Hensen emphasized that they must create authentic tasks for children in their classrooms. Authentic tasks allow for a wide range of interpretations and therefore often require that students deal with a certain amount of ambiguity. He cautioned the students to remember how they felt as they worked on such tasks when they ask their students to participate in authentic tasks.

Dr. Hensen said he had changed this course considerably to match what he thinks is happening in the field. He noted that teachers across the country are asking what a portfolio is and how to bring assessment more in line with new ideas about what we want to teach children. He told his students that the Wolf and Au articles are not representative of where teachers are now. Reflecting on current assessment practices in the schools, Dr. Hensen said:

Assessment in school classrooms stinks. They are awful. They are oppressive to students, they do not reflect learning, and they do not inform teachers' instructional decision making. They are a game to put a mark on a report card and for everybody to cover their back side. You have given me an hour and a half today of the inequalities of the system. You change it. Now creating an authentic kind of portfolio is a step in the right direction.
Dr. Hensen went on to tell the students that there are no answers to what an authentic portfolio is. He said they would have to think, and think hard, as they worked on this task. They could expect a certain amount of ambiguity and anxiety. He pointed out though that the thinking required for this task should pay off next year when they began their first year of teaching, because once they started teaching they would have a limited time for thinking about their assessment system.

Dr. Hensen informed the students that the portfolio task would be graded, thus making it a "high risk task." He also pointed out that the task was real. He said:

It is easy as hell to give you a final exam. We could skip all of this. I could give you an exam on the things. It is easy to say, do this all right, analyze a kid in reading and give me these responses. But those are not real. Those are not the things that will help you be the professional that you want to be.

He told the students that he did not have an answer as to what a portfolio is, other than his own. Therefore, he has no template for how they are to construct the portfolio. He said:

What I am looking for, the bottom line of this task is that you think about the work system in your
classroom for the purpose of informing the students, or informing others ... What is going on?

Dr. Hensen clarified that they were to create a system that they thought best represented the work in their classroom. They could include an "ideal level" as well as a "reality level." He was aware of the obstacles students might face as they started work on this task. He told them they should design a portfolio with lots of good thinking about it, even if their situations did not allow them to test it. Therefore, they may have to concentrate on some things more than others.

One student asked if they were to include things their cooperating teacher did that they themselves would not do. She said that all her students do is answer questions in the textbook. Dr. Hensen explained that a concept could be defined with what isn't as well as with what is. If their situation is so structured, they could put in samples of things they would not do. However, he said the bottom line is to create a system reflecting what assessment ought to look like in the classroom.

The students raised some questions regarding the task. Dr. Hensen answered each question in turn, thus providing further clarification as to the different ways they could approach the task. For example, one student asked if spelling, English, creative writing, and so on were to be included. Dr. Hensen reiterated that the
decision was theirs, depending on their definition of reading and language arts. He reminded them to use the Wolf and Au articles as a framework for the kinds of things they could include in a portfolio. How much of what to put in a kid's portfolio was a question they would have to come to grips with. He told them they had a great deal of latitude in their interpretations because of the ambiguity in the task. He said where the risk comes in, is that it is graded. He told them, "This is a tough task." He reminded them to keep in mind that he would not grade their portfolios against each other. He said he would look at each project and ask, "...does this reflect an understanding of the use of student work in third grade, fifth grade, whatever. That is the bottom line for this project."

Another student said she was still confused as to whether they were to develop a portfolio based on the constraints of the classroom they are now in or if they were to make one they wanted to use in the future, or whether it should be a combination of both. Dr. Hensen said it was their choice. What he was interested in was what would they put in a portfolio, why they would select that, and what it means to them.

A third student asked if they were to have just a folder of different types of work and an explanation of what they did at the end. Dr. Hensen repeated that what
he was looking for was specified on the class handout under "Final Project Should Include." He reiterated that they were not doing three mini case studies. They were evaluating the portfolio framework they set up by concentrating on what it makes sense to include. Then a student asked, "What was the purpose of getting three different leveled kids?" Dr. Hensen explained, to get a cross section. He told the class that the cross section might tell them something and it might not. If they could not get a cross section, that was fine. They could target one child.

2:58 - 3:08 p.m., Ending the Class

Dr. Hensen ended class by informing the students that they could get support for the task by setting a time to consult with him individually, or talk with people in their group next week. He gave them the option of coming to class next week or not. He told them they could come back next week and talk about the portfolio they were developing and find out what their colleagues were thinking relative to the task. He said they should continue looking at student work over this week and the next. Then wrap it up a weekend from this weekend and hand in everything the following Monday.

As the students were leaving the room Dr. Hensen talked with an individual student. A few students stayed for about eight minutes and talked some more with Dr.
Hensen about the portfolio task.

Debriefing 7
3:08 - 3:29 p.m., Reflections on the Class

Our session began with my comment that this was a neat class. Dr. Hensen commented that "highly personalized was a good suggestion" to the portfolio task. This comment had surfaced during the conversation with the students who stayed after class. It was something that Dr. Hensen said he knew and had in his head, but he just had not termed it in class that way. He said he also liked the idea of conferencing with students about the task because of the task complexity. He reiterated that the students would get an A- or A if they did a "half way decent job."

I told Dr. Hensen that I thought the grading task led well into the portfolio task. He agreed, stating that the "Monitoring Task Record Sheet" laid the foundation for the portfolio task. According to Dr. Hensen he spent double the time on this task than he had planned. However, he was happy with the way he presented the task. He said it was a good task, but he might change it a bit. Overall though he was pleased because it got his students to consider what you collect to put into a portfolio and it got them to think about how to use that information.

Time was a concern for Dr. Hensen relative to the monitoring task. He said that he usually asked more
questions than he did today. He made more statements
due to lack of time. He said he wanted to expose students
to a different kind of value system which they could either
identify with or reject. Hopefully, he would challenge
their value system to the point that it would make them
stop and think about what might occur in their classrooms
next year. Dr. Hensen said one way he could share his
knowledge and experience with students was to ask
questions. However it takes longer to use questions
than statements. He said he finds himself taking a
"heavier hand" when he and his students get into value
laden discussions.

Getting students to be reflective about their own
work was one of his goals in these tasks. This was
difficult though because as he pointed out, the students
were highly stressed. They had assignments from other
professors that were due in addition to the tasks he
required for the course. He stated that the students
would not be happy with the carry over. Thus, he said
he would have to "bite the bullet on that," but the group
support next week would help them deal with the additional
time it would take to do the task.

The portfolio task, according to Dr. Hensen, had
a great deal of ambiguity. He said the students probably
thought they would just be able to "slide out." He did
not expect the quality of the portfolio task to be very
good because of the lack of time. He said it would have been better if he had started the task a week earlier. The students would need at least a good three weeks to do the task, which he essentially provided. However, he said that he did not give them a good conception of what the field test was. He said he was not even sure what it was, so that should give the students good reason to be sick about it. Basically, his advice, which was similar to what he advises doctoral students to do, was to "just go do some of this." He said things begin to make some sense once they get going.

Dr. Hensen said that he just could not cut the grading discussion short because some of them really liked the task and he was getting some interesting comments from the groups. He said they did not have enough time to define the portfolio conceptually. They needed at least and hour to an hour and a half to complete the task and share their thinking. He said he would bring them back to it next week. They would have had a chance to try and develop a portfolio and could come back and discuss it with the group. However, he still liked the overall framework of the task. He said, "It's great," but admitted he had to figure out a way to grade/assess the students. He noted that the students were using their text readings and classroom experiences to add to the discussions.
Dr. Hensen noted that one thing raised the task ambiguity. That was that he presented the overall task sheet, instead of just giving the sub task first. He said he got them upset before they even got started, and he knew better than to do that. He did not mind upsetting them to a certain degree because it allows them to work through the task. However, he did not want to drive them away from the task. I told Dr. Hensen that if I were a beginning teacher, I would look at the task as something that I needed to know about. I reminded him that currently many teachers are exploring ways to better assess students.

Dr. Hensen concluded that he reached a good percentage of students in the class. He said, "There's about twenty of them I had right by the throat. They knew what the point was, that they've been sitting here abstracting away, and now it is time to put your money where your mouth is." Yet there were others, another six or seven, who he did not want to let up on. He had them struggle with what is important. He said that we end up doing some things we don't like as professionals and we have to know what we like and what we don't like. You should not pretend you like something that you don't. If you have to repress it, that's okay, he said, "but you better do it with a reason."

Next we talked again about how he would evaluate their projects. He said that he has given a different
kind of task but has attached a typical evaluation scheme to it. He reiterated that he liked the idea of the task being personalized, so he would have to personalize his evaluation in some way.

Dr. Hensen said that many of the students had been "handicapped" because they do not write as well as others. He questioned as to whether it is the students' thinking or the students' writing that is being evaluated. Dr. Hensen said that he needs to figure out ways to deal with this. I shared that I had been thinking about ways to accommodate different modalities of learning for college students, too. I explained that providing options is one good way to allow students some flexibility. It allows them to match their interests and learning styles with the required tasks of a course. For example, you could provide students with choices like learning logs, projects, exams, or combinations of these. Perhaps they could even design some of their own presentations that would represent their learning.

As the session closed, Dr. Hensen said that he hoped he had not been too hard on the students. He said they will mediate the task to meet their needs as they begin working with it. He noted, too, that it is difficult to come up with evaluation procedures for a task when it is being designed. It is important, however, that students have confidence that they will be safe in pursuing
the task. Dr. Hensen said that he has tried alternative assessments in the past where everyone but one person got an A because they mastered the objectives they set for themselves. He said on this task students would have to trust him. Moving to a personalized evaluation system requires such trust. The students should be comfortable with this because they have been with him for two semesters. He jokingly summarized his thinking on this topic:

All right, you've been under me two semesters, you're gonna have to trust that you're gonna come out all right. And that's a lot to buy. I mean look at what's at stake, a minus or you know an A- or an A. Big stakes (laughs).
Dr. Hensen's Use of Conversation to Develop His Teaching

The conversations that Dr. Hensen and I engaged in during the planning sessions and the debriefings, as well as the classroom interactions, helped Dr. Hensen develop his teaching further in a variety of ways. He used the conversations, 1) to create and refine tasks for students, 2) to assess the quality of the tasks, 3) to reflect on student performance, 4) to critique his instruction, 5) to reflect on himself as a teacher, and 6) to systematically focus on his teaching.

Creating and Refining Tasks

Dr. Hensen used the planning conversations as an opportunity to create and refine tasks which would reflect the kinds of experiences he wanted students to have during the course. He designed tasks which emphasized student participation in class activities and field assignments. Further, he desired to provide "interesting experiences as well as useful ones" for students when they were in class. The purpose of the tasks was to help students develop understandings of concepts related to the assessment of a child's reading. As he planned the tasks he struggled with issues like: how much should students do, what can they do, and how much time is available to accomplish a task.

Dr. Hensen often began designing a task by brainstorming several alternative approaches. For example, as he designed
the fluency task he brainstormed and briefly discussed several alternatives. These included: 1) have various
groups of students examine a set of questions on fluency,
2) use one of the case studies in the course text to pull
the concept of fluency together (to answer the questions),
3) start with a free write about fluency, 4) have the
students brainstorm and do a graphic organizer, 5) design
a task which says create a reading problem, or 6) create
a reading problem on fluency and have the students generate
appropriate instructional decisions. From alternatives
he generated in the brainstorming events, he selected what
he would implement in the classroom. In the case of the
fluency task, he selected the following ideas, which he
sketched out in a notebook:

I. In groups of two or three, brainstorm major features
of the concept "fluency." Create a graphic organizer
for these features. Share organizer with another group
and note similarities and differences or revise
organizer if you wish.

II. Passage Analysis

Purpose: Analyze pupil's reading fluency. In margin
indicate how many reading errors/miscues are in every
line (Group). Compare your analysis with another group.
Give the number of errors and specific errors. Provide
reasons.

The process he used for developing the fluency task was
typical for each task. He usually brainstormed some alternatives, talked through each to sort out his ideas, then selected which of the alternatives he would use in the classroom.

The major form of conversation that Dr. Hensen used when developing the tasks was a "think aloud." He verbalized his thoughts about a task as he developed it. The verbalizations included spontaneous responses about the tasks as well as descriptions of the procedures he used to develop tasks. It was as though he imagined himself teaching as he talked through the teaching actions. The following conversation is illustrative. He was discussing how he could use a reading passage to get students involved in a reasoning process about a child's reading fluency. He said:

The first thing I can do is have them do a task which says, 'What is reading fluency and why is it important?' Those are critical. Now having said that, then we can do this (analyze the selected passage) and see if we can figure that out. Now we have not listened to the kid. It is a little hard in that sense, but I can make up a speed thing.

The brainstorm and think alouds illustrate two of the forms of conversation Dr. Hensen used throughout the sessions to think through the development of tasks. However, conversation was only one mediating "tool" he used to assist
his thinking. He also used tools such as books, articles, stories, writing, and so on to create materials for the classroom.

Dr. Hensen also had problems he had to think about as he created and refined tasks. He discussed several issues that confront him as students get involved with the tasks and field assignments. For instance, when a task requires students to bring in technical equipment such as tape recorders, they often forget or they bring in recorders that malfunction or have weak batteries. Dr. Hensen ameliorated such problems by bringing in several recorders himself. Another problem he encounters is with tasks that require students to bring in samples of children's work. Many times students give the children's work samples back to children before the task is completed in class. Also, the students sometimes are not heavily involved in classroom instruction when a particular task is assigned. In this situation, Dr. Hensen makes adjustments in the task by having students pair up and share samples of children's work.

Assessing the Quality of Tasks

Dr. Hensen frequently used the conversations to reflect on the quality of tasks. This was particularly noted in the debriefing sessions, although he often elaborated on tasks when planning. He talked about the overall effectiveness of the tasks, whether or not the tasks were successful, what he liked and did not like about the tasks,
and how he could improve them. For example, when he discussed the fluency task, he said he was pleased with how it went and that the task accomplished what he wanted to do.

Similarly, in reference to the portfolio task, he stated that he spent more time on the task in class than he had planned, but was happy with the way he presented the task to the students. Due to the ambiguity of the portfolio task and lack of time the students had to complete the task outside of class, Dr. Hensen said he did not expect them to produce as high a quality product as he would if they had more time. This was a new task for the course, so Dr. Hensen was dealing with a great amount of ambiguity himself in developing the task. Nonetheless, he said the students would make more sense of the task as they delved into it.

**Reflecting on Student Performance**

Dr. Hensen also used conversation about students' performance as a means to inform his teaching. Realizing the constraints that students worked under, provided valuable information for making decisions about tasks. For example, in one debriefing session, Dr. Hensen commented that the students had worked in the field all day, hence they would be able to work only so long in class. He noted that students become "highly stressed" as the semester progresses. This stress develops because, in addition to completing tasks for the assessment course, the students are fulfilling
student teaching responsibilities in the field, and are heavily involved in completing assignments for other professors.

Dr. Hensen accommodated such concerns in his classroom in several ways. One, he consistently provided students with a short break midway of the class sessions so they could "stretch their legs." Two, he helped them deal with the stress of the tasks by setting their minds at ease. For example, when presenting the narrative and expository field assignments to the students, he told them they could approach the tasks in any way they could work it out. Letting students know up front that such "authentic tasks" allow for different interpretations and that they should expect some ambiguity, helped establish a more comfortable, relaxed atmosphere.

Dr. Hensen had the students approach the portfolio task in a similar fashion. He adjusted the portfolio task to meet the needs of each individual student's situation. He realized that such provisions had to be made because the students were teaching in different grade levels and in different situations. Therefore, he told the students that he had "no template for the portfolio task." This allowed the students more freedom and choice relative to how they might approach the task. The third way Dr. Hensen accommodated students' concerns was by making himself available to students after class. Following several class
sessions he met with individuals or groups of students to talk about questions or concerns they had. I perceived those meetings as an opportunity for Dr. Hensen to get feedback from the students relative to their performance and as an effort to support their professional development. Dr. Hensen often stated that much of what the students do and say influences the direction he moves the course. He assessed student performance not only to provide authentic, meaningful, participatory tasks, but to build support systems that would help them develop a broad perspective of the teaching profession.

Student performance on particular tasks sometimes surprised Dr. Hensen. For example, when the students began work on the fluency task, he was surprised that they had trouble with the term "graphic organizer." He noted that when such surprises occur he has to adapt his instruction. In this case, he took time in class to elaborate on the meaning of the term and provided several examples based on the students' previous experiences. He said he ended up spending more time on the fluency task than he had planned due to that surprise. He commented that it just "proves again and again how little students get out of what we think we are doing for them."

Sometimes student performance worried Dr. Hensen. For instance, when discussing the narrative and expository tasks he stated that he was worried about what the students
got from class. This caused additional worry about what they would do during the field assignment. However, Dr. Hensen did not seem too concerned. He stated that the best testing of the tasks would be for the students to check out their questions they generated in class with real children in the field. The students would sort out some of the ambiguity and the task would become more meaningful to them. Dr. Hensen said he would also provide an opportunity in the next class to make further clarifications. He would have the students analyze their questions while they had his assistance and the support of each other.

Critiquing His Instruction

Dr. Hensen often used the debriefing sessions to critique his instruction. He highlighted what he did and did not like about the tasks, and whether the tasks were successful. For example, as he reflected on the first class that I attended, he stated that he was not as pleased as he would like to be relative to the amount of student participation. To compensate, he said he would make a concerted effort to have some interactive and participatory kinds of activities for the next class. The students would be "more energized." Dr. Hensen focused on the issue of student participation throughout the sessions.

Another area he focused upon was the improvement of his tasks. He commented that he was starting to design tasks so students would be able to see them more explicitly.
That would help students gain a better perspective of the task environment and better understandings about the purposes of tasks.

There were many times too when Dr. Hensen liked the instruction. He often shared his thoughts and feelings regarding the success of instructional tasks. For example, he said he felt good about what the students got from the narrative and expository tasks once they got into them. He was pleased that a lot of discussion took place and that the students were engaged in the tasks for a good amount of time. He was also happy with the way he presented the portfolio task.

**Reflecting on Himself as a Teacher**

Dr. Hensen also used conversation to reflect on who he was as a teacher. He talked about himself and his work from time to time throughout the sessions. During our first planning session I learned that much of his work has focused on the importance of planning and reflection for teachers. He was examining ways teachers could share their planning and reflection about teaching.

The conversations we had at the end of the study extensively revealed Dr. Hensen's teaching experiences, his interests, and his philosophy about teaching and learning. He reflected about the processes he went through to reach his current position, as well as the experiences that influenced his thinking. His descriptions
helped me get to know him better as a person and as a teacher. Much of the information from the conversations was summarized in chapter 3 where I provided a brief biographical sketch of his work.

**Systematic Focus on Teaching**

Dr. Hensen revealed that he benefited from the processes of this study because he was able to focus on and accomplish some of the goals which he had had in mind for some time. Meeting on a regular basis helped him bring together a "whole host of thoughts." He said he articulated and interacted in ways that he would not have done if he were thinking about his teaching by himself. In the past he had only been "studying small pieces" of his work. The conversations helped him think in a more cohesive, systematic way, and more extensively about his teaching. He said the conversations helped him "chunk things" and examine ideas in more depth. Additionally, our regular meetings helped him reduce procrastinating.

**How the Conversations Related to my Learning**

I felt very comfortable talking with Dr. Hensen during the planning sessions and debriefings. He willingly shared his teaching ideas and experiences throughout our conversations. Therefore, I acquired many helpful ideas and strategies that I will continue to reflect upon as I construct learning environments for students. The conversations proved very beneficial to my own learning,
particularly since I was interested in learning more about university teaching. I gained: 1) confidence in myself as a learner, 2) a repertoire of ideas to incorporate in my teaching, 3) strategies for engaging students in the learning process, 4) a better understanding of the capabilities of students preparing to teach, 5) insight about materials a university teacher might use, and 6) knowledge about responsibilities and opportunities connected to university teaching.

**Building Confidence**

My confidence was built in a variety of ways throughout the study. Perhaps the most significant way was that I came to realize I was not only learning from a highly respected teacher, but I was contributing to his learning as well. This realization was an important awareness for me as a teacher. I discovered, through our conversations, that my experiences and ideas often supported and augmented Dr. Hensen's thinking and planning. When I shared experiences and ideas about teaching, he subsequently indicated that he went forward and used some of them. For example, in the second planning session I shared a reading miscue passage with him which he developed further and used as a comprehension task for the next class session. Then, in the seventh planning session I shared a set of questions I had considered asking the students to get additional data for the study. Dr. Hensen said he could
have the students answer the questions at the end of a class session and he could use them as an evaluation of the course. He suggested that I consider using the PMI form (Pluses, Minuses, and Interesting Points) in conjunction with the questions I had in mind. He shared an example of a PMI he used successfully last semester with students. Thus, he supported the work I had done relative to generating the questions and at the same time broadened my perspective of another approach I could take. I decided to explore the possibilities and as a result ended up with a much better evaluation tool. I currently use the PMI form to assess courses I teach.

Such sharing experiences were edifying. Confidence in my abilities to contribute to the sessions was increased by such interactions. Therefore, as the sessions progressed, I became more assertive in sharing ideas, experiences, and materials that I thought might be helpful.

I became more confident not only as a helper, but as a university teacher. Talking with Dr. Hensen helped me become more cognizant of my own thinking and beliefs about teaching at the university level. For instance, the importance of personal characteristics in teaching situations was salient to me at the beginning of the study, but it was more salient at the end because of the experiences I had throughout the study. The demeanor Dr. Hensen displayed throughout the sessions reinforced my thinking about the
importance of considering the personal qualities that facilitate engaging in conversations. He consistently displayed a personable, sharing, and caring attitude as he worked with me and as he worked with students. His nature greatly contributed to establishing an environment in which I felt comfortable enough to share my experiences and offer comments and suggestions.

**Develop a Repertoire of Ideas**

I acquired many ideas by participating in conversations with Dr. Hensen about teaching that I otherwise would not have had the opportunity to consider. Thus, I developed a repertoire of ideas for university teaching which I will continue to explore and adapt to my teaching needs. I have a description of each task that Dr. Hensen developed for the course. I also have the transcriptions of our conversations which include other ideas I may explore, even though he did not develop them at the time of this study.

I find myself consistently referring to the transcriptions for ideas and clarifications as I develop learning environments for students in courses I teach. I review the transcriptions for both content and process, depending on my needs at the time. Some of the tasks I use in a very similar manner to the way Dr. Hensen did in his course. Others I modify to accomplish other objectives I have in mind. For example, I have used the concentric circle idea from the comprehension task several times with
with students. This particular activity asks students to write down three things they would tell someone about comprehension if they had an opportunity. They are free to select their audience (a colleague, a parent, a student, etc.). Once the students complete their writing they are asked to form two concentric circles, each circle with the same number of students. The students in the outside circle face the center while the students in the inside circle each face a member of the outside circle. One circle stays stationary while the other rotates to the right on command by the instructor. Next, each student shares his/her ideas about comprehension with the person s/he is facing. Upon the change command, the students shift once to the right. Each student then shares his/her ideas with another person. Finally, upon another command, the students shift and share once more.

The day I observed the activity Dr. Hensen had to alter the plan. The classroom was too small and had too many desks to clear a space large enough to make the circles. So, after the free write, instead of two circles, the students formed two lines at the front of the room facing each other. Each student shared his/her ideas with the person s/he was facing in the line. Then Dr. Hensen directed one line to shift once to the right. Each student then shared his/her ideas with a new person. They repeated this one more time. Immediately following the activity, Dr.
Hensen led a large group discussion with the class regarding the benefits of the activity.

I decided that the concentric circle idea would be a great one for me to try with students. It seemed easy enough as I observed Dr. Hensen implement it with students. However, I discovered that it was not as easy to implement as it looked. The first time I had a group do the activity I had to make quite a few adjustments. I had reviewed the transcriptions to see what Dr. Hensen did and said when he presented the task to students, but I did not thoroughly think through the process myself prior to implementation. I planned to do the activity as Dr. Hensen described it (in circles). However, I would have been more successful had I used lines instead of circles. Even though I thought there was plenty of room for the activity, I quickly discovered that the students needed more explicit directions before I turned the task over to them. I should have anticipated potential problems. It worked out in the end, but it could have run much smoother.

The second time I used the task, I also reviewed the transcriptions, but I thought through the whole process more carefully before I asked the students to do it. I provided more detailed, clearer directions. So even though the task appeared easy when I observed Dr. Hensen do it, I had to think it through thoroughly myself and make it a part of me before I could have students smoothly carry
out the task.

Conversations with Dr. Hensen also led me to think about developing tasks that help students build frameworks for thinking about teaching and learning. He spent much of his planning time discussing and developing such frameworks. The emphasis he placed on frameworks helped me realize that frameworks can help students build schemas for working with children in a classroom. Once students develop and internalize a variety of frameworks for working with children they are more apt to make better decisions about the content they teach. Helping students develop frameworks that will be useful to them later in their teaching career is a much more meaningful approach than having them remember facts to pass a multiple choice test.

Another idea that I want to develop as part of my teaching is to provide students with written copies of tasks I have them do. I observed that Dr. Hensen consistently provided students with written copies of the tasks and field assignments. I believe such provisions help the class run smoother and save time. When students have a copy of the task directions in front of them, it helps reduce the number of questions they have to ask. The students also have a handout which they can use as a reference for future reflection on the objectives of the task.

I use this repertoire not just as a collection of ideas, but as a way to spark my thinking about possibilities for
engaging students in meaningful learning experiences. Often times I modify or change an idea to fit a particular situation or to help accomplish a particular goal. For example, I used the concentric circle idea with a variety of topics. The concentric circle idea is a good way to get students involved in any lesson and get them to share ideas and experiences with each other.

Engaging Students in the Learning Process

As a developing university instructor I was very interested in the ways Dr. Hensen got students involved in the tasks. I was confident I would discover several strategies that I would want to emulate in my own teaching. Thus, I became increasingly more sensitive to the quality of Dr. Hensen's efforts and impressed with his approaches. He used a variety of strategies to engage students in tasks. These included: having students work in pairs or small groups to discuss and share ideas; designing field assignments which encouraged students to delve into concepts more deeply; having students use materials and experiences from their own work in the field; and conducting whole group discussions to summarize key issues. Observing Dr. Hensen use a variety of approaches supported my thinking about the importance of modeling strategies that students can use with children in the classroom. I have often commented to students that it is one thing to say that students should have opportunities to work collaboratively, but it is another
to model it. It does not make much sense to tell beginning teachers that group work is important, yet only lecture about content.

Another significant point that influenced my thinking about processes for learning was that Dr. Hensen provided many opportunities for students to get the task right or to improve their performance. He allowed them to "mess around" with ideas and to test their ideas, instead of saying this is what you do. He helped relieve students' anxiety about the tasks by informing them that many tasks contain ambiguity. He emphasized that there was room for different interpretations and approaches. Additionally, due dates for assignments were used as guides, not mandates.

In essence Dr. Hensen's efforts helped students become professional decision makers with regard to curriculum, instead of regurgitators of information.

**Abilities of University Students**

At the beginning of this study, I was in the process of making a transition from teaching upper elementary school students for fifteen years to teaching education courses at the university level. I knew my approaches with university students would have to be somewhat different from what I had done with elementary students. Therefore, I was very interested in learning more about the capabilities of university students. My conversations with Dr. Hensen
helped me gain a better understanding of what university students are capable of doing.

One real important consideration in planning is whether a task is appropriate for students. Dr. Hensen addressed this issue several times during the study. For example, during the first planning session, he discussed at length that goals and objectives should be connected to one's criteria for grading. Thus, he searched for an example of such a process to share with students. He read a selection about one teacher's approach for establishing such criteria, but after some consideration, he commented that the process of aligning one's evaluation system with a task is hard for beginners.

Again, in the second planning session, a similar incident occurred. Dr. Hensen was looking for a case study passage to help students gain a better understanding of the concept fluency. He read a passage from Understanding Reading Problems: Assessment and Instruction (Gillet & Temple, 1990) that dealt with scoring an informal reading inventory. He immediately said that the information was too difficult for beginners and that they definitely would not do that.

Situations like those mentioned above helped me gain a better perception of what to ask university students to do. As I plan for a course now I often reflect on the conversations Dr. Hensen and I had about materials that
may be too difficult for beginners. I ask myself if the ideas I am considering might be too difficult for students to do. In fact, I spend more time thinking about the appropriateness of tasks I develop because that was such an important part of Dr. Hensen's thinking. I would probably be less inclined to think about this issue had he not focused on it as he planned the reading assessment course.

**Responsibilities and Opportunities at the University Level**

I learned a lot about the responsibilities and opportunities Dr. Hensen had as I listened to him talk about his teaching experiences and commitments. He shared that commitments to the university, in addition to teaching, can be time consuming and demanding. They often "lead you in other directions," taking time from teaching responsibilities. Some of the responsibilities and opportunities that he addressed during the study included: working with a publishing company as a consultant, attending many conferences, presenting work at various conferences, reading extensively to keep current, and writing.

**Materials an Instructor Uses**

As an elementary classroom teacher so much of what you plan and how you plan for teaching is directed by curriculum guides, teacher's manuals, SOL state guides, etc. Teachers at the elementary level have some flexibility in how they use the materials, but basically the content
covered is selected and approved by someone else. I started
teaching in the elementary classroom in the mid 70's when
teachers were directed to follow an adopted program. I
remember being required to use every workbook page and every
skills worksheet, in sequence, chapter by chapter when a
new reading series was adopted. Fortunately, that paradigm
was short lived. Later, the Madeline Hunter Teaching Model
was introduced and teachers were encouraged to teach
according to her model. Training sessions were provided
to insure that each teacher acquired knowledge of the model.
Principals then used the model as a guide for evaluating
the teachers' performance. Later, less emphasis was placed
on the model as being the model, mainly because Madeline
Hunter spoke at a conference and stated that many of her
ideas had been taken to extremes by various interpreters
of her work. Gradually I noticed that teachers were given
more autonomy in how they designed learning environments
for students.

When I started teaching at the university level, I
kept waiting for someone to say, "This is the text you are
to use for the course." However, that did not happen.
I learned from my conversations with Dr. Hensen the he
had a great amount of flexibility in selecting the texts
and materials he used to teach the course. It was
interesting to me to watch the process he went through as
he selected materials. Even though he used a course text
(Barr, Sadow, & Blachowicz, 1990), he was not restricted to that text. He used a variety of other materials. He used other texts, magazine articles, audio cassette tapes, tradebooks, and basalss. He determined the materials he used based on what would best accommodate the task he was designing. I like the freedom an instructor has in selecting materials for a course. In particular, I like the fact that you can change a text the next semester if you find that it is not meeting your needs for a course, or you discover a better, more recently published text. Using current publications also helps keep students abreast with up to date information. You do not have to wait five or six years before another text is approved for a course as I did when teaching elementary school.

In summary, I learned about the discretion that can be applied to the use of materials and other instructional activities when teaching at the university level. As an elementary school teacher I used discretion in materials given. At the university level I am using discretion to choose different kinds of materials and to design instruction using an array of materials. Now when I plan for teaching I pull from a variety of materials and sources. I use the transcriptions of this study, information provided by textbook companies, ideas from other colleagues, my own experiences, and feedback from students. I approach a task with the realization that I will try an idea and see how
it goes. If it works and the students respond positively and learn from it, then I will keep it. If it flops, I will either try again, modify it, or let it go. One thing for sure, it takes a lot of study and preparation to create rich learning environments for students. One has to plan, read, and assess students' progress continually.
CHAPTER 5
Conclusions, Implications, Recommendations

This chapter communicates the conclusions derived from my analysis of the four selected sequences described in chapter 4. Additionally, implications and recommendations for further research are included.

Conclusions

I am convinced that familiarizing myself with the theoretical constructs of Vygotsky, Wertsch, and Tharp and Gallimore provided me with effective frameworks to better understand the "workings" of an experienced professor and the process in which he and I engaged to become more informed about our teaching. The zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978; & Wertsch, 1984) and the notion of an activity setting (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) helped me think more holistically about what was occurring in the planning sessions, the class meetings, and the debriefings. It became evident to me that a support system for learning occurred which allowed Dr. Hensen and me to go beyond what we could have done alone. Therefore, this study represents a Vygotskian model of teacher education which is different from the traditional way of preparing teachers. It was Vygotskian in the sense that a more skilled teacher educator interacted with a less skilled teacher educator using conversation as a mediating "tool" for learning. In this model, the more
experienced teacher made his teaching accessible not by
telling how to teach, but by openly displaying his
processes in teaching through conversations about planning
and teaching. The conversations provided me (the less
experienced teacher educator) with an access to the
language, actions, and materials of Dr. Hensen (the more
experienced teacher educator). At the same time, Dr.
Hensen used the conversations to "move his teaching
forward."

In fact, conversation was a very important part of
the learning process in this study. Dr. Hensen and I
shared "stories" (Bruner, 1990) about our teaching
experiences and beliefs throughout the study. Sharing
stories, according to Bruner, helps individuals make sense
of culture. Thus, conversations helped me make sense
of what occurred in the selected sequences discussed in
chapter 4. Not only did I learn a great deal about the
materials Dr. Hensen used and the approaches he took to
instruction, but I came to appreciate the significance
of conversation in assisting learning. I now strongly
agree with Bruner's statement that:

One of the most ubiquitous and powerful discourse
forms in human communication is narrative.

Another aspect of the study that was very significant
was the notion that coparticipation (Lave & Wenger, 1991)
facilitates learning. According to Lave and Wenger social
engagement provides the proper context for learning to take place. A wide range of conditions occur in which participants engage in a variety of roles such as the learning practitioner, a response agent, an aspiring expert and so on. Thus, learning takes place in a participation framework in which coparticipants distribute learning. Conversation is a basic mode of access to the interactions. Throughout this study I participated "peripherally" in the conversations. That is, I started the study heavily observing Dr. Hensen as he planned and taught. As the study got more underway, I gradually became more involved in the conversations and brought more materials to share.

The cordial tone that Dr. Hensen established in the sessions also augmented the learning that took place during the study. Several qualities that facilitate learning occurred in the study. Qualities such as genuineness, prizing the learner, and an empathetic understanding were prevalent. Such attitudinal qualities in personal relationships between the facilitator and the learner increase the chances of significant learning (Rogers & Freiberg, 1994). Indeed, Rogers believed that one of the most important conditions that facilitate learning is the attitudinal relationship between the facilitator and learner.

As the writing of my analysis of the study came to
a close, I realized that there was a continued concern about colleagues having opportunities to collaborate and converse about their teaching. Issues about the uses of language (Bruner, 1990), coparticipation (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and teacher as facilitator of learning (Rogers & Freiberg, 1994) continue to catch the interest of researchers.

One final conclusion about the study is that I became more sensitive to the fact that when doing research you need to be attuned to all areas that might contribute to the study. Other data might have proved useful. For example, additional reflections by Dr. Hensen may have shown how he made sense of his practice; some comments from students would have provided information about their backgrounds, ages, and their views on the class; and video taping of some sessions would have added further insights.

Implications

The information presented in this study may prove valuable to someone, as it did to me, who is interested in learning more about teaching teachers to teach. The Vygotskian model of teacher preparation is a viable model and should be explored more seriously as a way to support the development of teachers, particularly at the university level.

Information from the study may also prove helpful to someone interested in learning about how conversations
may be used to enhance one's teaching. The study indicates that conversations within an activity setting framework can provide teachers with a way to share ideas and experiences and to explore potential problems (or successes) in teaching and learning.

Another implication of the study is that it is a mistake to try to measure one's learning at the end of course work. We often think when a course is completed that an individual has "finished" his/her learning relative to the course. However, this study strongly supports the notion that learning is continuous and evolves over time. For instance, when I plan for instruction, I notice that many of the conversations about teaching and learning that Dr. Hensen and I had come back to me. I find myself continually using my understandings of this study to mediate my teaching. The understandings are ongoing as I become more involved in planning and teaching at the university level. Dealing with teaching problems on a weekly basis makes this manifest. Therefore, the study implies that we may want to examine teacher learning by observing one's future teaching.

**Recommendations**

I am convinced, based on my experience with this study, that in order to develop a more informed view of what constitutes good, effective instruction (characterized by a "master teacher"), teachers need opportunities to
interact with one another about their teaching. Teacher educators usually do not tell much about their planning and teaching, especially in front of a less experienced person. Much of what an experienced professor does remains hidden. Nevertheless, we are in a better position to make suggestions relative to what others might want to consider and emulate in the development of a learning environment for teachers when we are more informed about ways experienced successful teachers develop their practice. A novice or less experienced teacher can learn much from the experienced practitioner. Therefore, I propose that the kind of model presented in this study be explored further.

Teachers say conversation is helpful to spark thinking about their work. This study suggests that it is helpful. The conversations which Dr. Hensen and I had during this study were certainly indicative that teachers find emotional and technical support in collaboration with colleagues (Wildman & Niles, 1987). Therefore, I would strongly recommend that others have similar opportunities to converse about their ideas and experiences.

We also need to study ways to create opportunities for teachers to converse without taxing their existing schedules. Teachers need time to share their experiences, frustrations, successes, etc. They can acquire many good ideas and strategies by talking with each other. We need
to look at situations when faculty members are necessarily brought together. Perhaps we could provide times within required courses, within faculty meetings, or other structured times for teachers to have conversations. My experience has been that most faculty meetings and grade level meetings focus on pragmatics. Little, if any, time is provided for teachers to talk about their work. I believe teachers need systematic, quality time to focus on whatever issues they perceive to be important. Perhaps a monthly, or quarterly time could be set aside for teachers to discuss something they read in the literature recently related to their work, to share ideas or problems they are having, to share strategies they have tried and found helpful, or to share any other important issues.

Additional research is needed to provide more information upon which to base the effectiveness of colleague conversations as a means to improve one's teaching. Other case studies could be conducted with "master teachers" engaging in conversations about their teaching. From such studies we could identify similarities and differences of themes and discover additional tools used by experienced practitioners.
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Appendix A
LIST OF MEETINGS AND TIMES
LIST OF MEETINGS AND TIMES

Thurs., 1-10-91  Met with Dr. Hensen to discuss possible study

Sat., 1-12-91  Planning Session  7:00 A.M.  2hrs. 4min.
Mon., 1-14-91  Class Meeting  12:00 P.M.  2hrs. 47min.
Debriefing Session  20min.

Sat., 1-19-91  Planning Session  8:00 A.M.  3hrs. 5min.
Mon., 1-21-91  Class Meeting  12:00 P.M.  2hrs. 46min.
Debriefing Session  6min.

Wed., 1-23-91  Planning Session  11:30 A.M.  1hr. 39min.
Mon., 1-28-91  Class Meeting  6:00 P.M.  2hrs. 18min.
Debriefing Session  40min.

Sat., 2-2-91  Planning Session  8:00 A.M.  1hr. 40min.
Mon., 2-4-91  Class Meeting  12:00 P.M.  2hrs. 33min.
Wed., 2-6-91  Debriefing Session  11:56 A.M.  8min.

Wed., 2-6-91  Planning Session  11:45 A.M.  2hrs. 3min.
Mon., 2-11-91  Class Meeting  12:00 P.M.  2hrs. 46min.
Debriefing Session  27min.

Sat., 2-16-91  Planning Session  8:00 A.M.  1hr. 45min.
Mon., 2-18-91  Class Meeting  12:00 P.M.  2hrs. 32min.
Debriefing Session  10min.

Sat., 2-23-91  Planning Session  8:00 A.M.  2hrs. 3min.
Mon., 2-25-91  Class Meeting  12:00 P.M.  3hrs. 2min.
Debriefing Session  21min.

Mon., 3-4-91  Class Meeting  12:00 P.M.  2hrs. 18min.
Debriefing Session  29min.

Sat., 3-30-91  Portfolio Session  9:00 A.M.  2hrs. 31min.

Mon., 6-17-91  Interview Session  61min.
Appendix B
SAMPLE NOTES BY DR. HENSEN
Class 1/14/21

1. Questions

2. Print Awareness
   Brainstorm - Two people
   a) All the concepts or strategies you can think of related to print awareness
   b) Draw a box - circles x 3 to add to chart
   c) Share your box with your team
   
   Main Sections
   Story element Reading p.26
   LCA
   Conclusion Writing p.30

   Knowledge of Print
   Word Awareness - basic words, definitions, spelling p.43, 35-41
   Sketch vocabulary - draw sketches, fishbowl, brainstorm, think, fish, and circle words.

   Listen to just and then
Fluency

I. Issues

C. How do we recognize words: 203-62
   Case # Interpretation
   Interpretation: Instant Recognition
   Automaticity of Interpretation
   Motoric/Visual Control

   1. Distribution of attention
   2. Meaning
   3. Anxiety

   Good
   Word ID
   Good
   Analyze
   Guess

Your job
   a) Must have found of instant words
   b) Must pay attention to graphic details
   c) Should use context when appropriate
And Reading -

1. What does difficulty mean?
2. What is an error?

3. What criteria will we use for evaluating performance?
   (about 2/3 p. 74)
4. Let's analyze figure
   a) What about speed? p. 71
   b) What about correction?
Daily Vocabulary Assessment
What is it?

Good enough is the goal. I'm often asked: What do I want my students to do?

I need the students, their attention to the task.

Experience

What experience do the students have? I need to run through the task and achieve the goal.

Task environment

Understanding, resources, materials, tools, feedback, risk, learning, tasks, concerns.

What else?

1. Just try to start and analyze;
2. Just look and analyze, then do these components.
Appendix C
COURSE SYLLABUS
Purpose of the Course

The purpose of the course is to develop your ability, knowledge and skills in using pupil data for planning, conducting and evaluating instruction. The essence of this course is to promote independent and strategic decision making on the part of the teacher.

Objectives

1) To learn what pupil information to look for in instructional settings.
2) To learn how to conduct strategic observation.
3) To learn how to interpret the information from your observations.
4) To learn how to transform your interpretations into instructional actions.
5) To develop an understanding of academic work.
6) To develop an awareness of the relationship between pupil performance and teacher created academic tasks.
7) To develop a positive attitude towards using data to guide your instructional decisions.

Course Requirements

1) Field Assignments - Completion of 80% on a pass/fail basis.
2) Case Study - Due January 8th
3) Lesson Analysis Project - Due January 29th
4) Diagnostic Problem Solving Project - March 4th
5) Class Participation

Reading Assignments in RDT (Reading Diagnosis for Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office Hours
Before and After Class
Others by Appointment
Appendix D
CASE STUDY ASSIGNMENT
CASE STUDY

Purpose: To develop an in depth understanding of two learners in your classroom and to use them as a lens for understanding the learning and language dynamics of the classroom as a whole.

1. Continue to collect as much information as possible on your two focal students.

2. Develop a written case study which includes the following:
   a. An explanation of why you chose the focal students.
   b. A description of the major sources of information you used to build the description and an explanation of why you chose them.
   c. A description of the children as learners and language users. You may include copies of student work where appropriate. Please describe each child independently.
   d. A discussion of how your findings could or do affect the instructional decisions that are made for your learner by you or your teacher.
   e. A comparison of the two learners that provides insight into their learning status in the classroom.

3. Finally, complete your study by reflecting upon what you have learned from it.

Criteria for evaluation:

1. Thoughtfulness of your rationale for selecting the two students
2. Variety and appropriateness of sources of information
3. Well roundedness of description
4. Analysis of instructional importance
5. Quality of the comparison
6. Linkage of observations and judgments
Appendix E
CALENDAR OUTLINE OF COURSE TOPICS
Suppose that you have some beautiful poppies growing in your garden. Suppose, too, that you want to get some seed from them so that you can have more poppies like them next year. You must be sure, then, not to pick all the poppy flowers. If you do not leave some of the flowers on the plant, you will not have any seeds, for the flowers are the part of the plant that produces the seeds. There will not be any seeds if all the flowers are picked.

Most seeds come from flowers. The seeds of pine trees and of the trees and bushes of the pine family are formed in cones. But most other seeds come from flowers. More than 190,000 kinds of plants produce seeds, and all but about 700 produce their seeds in flowers.

Not all flowers are large and bright-colored like poppies. Probably you have seen many flowers that you did not know were flowers. Did you ever see any cottonwood flowers, or willow flowers, or grass flowers?

Cottonwood trees and willow trees and grass have flowers, but their flowers are small and are not bright-colored. Many other plants have small flowers much like these.

When the early settlers came to America, trade was carried on by barter or by using such things as tobacco, sugar, and furs as money. Sometimes the settlers used Indian wampum. Wampum was shells that were made into beads and was used by the Indians as decoration and as money. Of course, when more people came from Europe to settle in America, they found they would need money to pay workers. A reason did not always want to take furs for his pay. A furrier did not always want his wages in grain or tools. People had to have coins, so they used whatever was available—English shillings, Swedish and Dutch money, and Spanish dollars, or “pieces of eight.” The Colonists soon found there were not enough of these to go around.

England would not let the Colonists make any money of their own. But in 1652, Massachusetts set up a mint and made its own coins anyway.

Among these were the famous “pine-tree shillings.” They were called this because the picture of a pine tree was stamped on them. These pine-tree shillings were made for thirty-four years, but they all had the same date on them. In this way, the Colonists pretended that they were staying in England.

1. What did the early settlers use in place of money? (tobacco, sugar, furs, wampum, shells, tools)
2. What kind of money did the Indians use? (wampum or shells or beads)
3. How might a worker have been paid? (tobacco, sugar, wampum, money)
4. At first, the settlers had no money or coins of their own. What kind of money (or whose money?) did they use? (tobacco, Spanish or Dutch or Swedish or English or Indian or wampum)
5. What did the Colonists finally do about getting money of their own? (made some)
6. Where was this money made? (in Massachusetts)
7. What was the design stamped on these coins? (pine tree)
Appendix G
ORAL READING ANALYSIS FORM
**ORAL READING ANALYSIS**

Name: 
Grade: 
Date: 
Book/Page: 
Level: 

### A. DIFFICULTY

- 

- 

**% Correct**

Level: 
- Independent
- Instructional
- Borderline
- Frustration

### B. WORD LEARNING: Sight Word Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Word</th>
<th>Oral Response</th>
<th>Probe</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. WORD IDENTIFICATION: Content Word Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Word</th>
<th>Oral Response</th>
<th>Probe</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. INTEGRATION—FLUENCY

Integration:

Fluency Rate: 

wpm 

Evaluation:

Fluency Rate: 

wpm 

Evaluation:
Appendix H
CLASSROOM READING MISCUE ASSESSMENT FORM
### Classroom Reading Miscue Assessment
Developed by Coordinators/Consultants Applying Whole Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reader's name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade level assignment</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection read:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I. What percent of the sentences read make sense?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence by sentence tally</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of semantically acceptable sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of semantically unacceptable sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Comprehending score: Number of semantically acceptable sentences</th>
<th>x 100 TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of sentences read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. In what ways is reader constructing meaning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In what ways is reader disrupting meaning?</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Recognizes when miscues have disrupted meaning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Logically substitutes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Self-corrects errors that disrupt meaning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Uses picture and/or other visual clues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In what ways is reader disrupting meaning?</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Substitutes words that don’t make sense</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Makes omissions that disrupt meaning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Relies too heavily on graphic clues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. If narrative text is used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Character recall</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Character development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Setting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Relationship of events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Plot</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Theme</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Overall retelling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Major concepts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Generalizations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Specific information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Logical structuring</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Overall retelling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I
FIELD ASSIGNMENT 4
FIELD ASSIGNMENT 4

In class: Listen to student's reading and do an analysis using the format suggested by your book. Next fill out a classroom reading miscue assessment on his reading. Finally write a summary paragraph on the student's reading.

You may do this task alone or in a group of 2 or 3. After you have completed each activity, you should consult with and compare your work with that of your colleagues or me.

Out of class: Complete a CRMA on a student. Tape it if possible and bring it to class on the 21st.
Appendix J
MISCUE SHEET OF ROB'S READING
Sheep dogs work hard on a farm. They must learn to take the sheep from place to place. They must see that the sheep do not run away. And they must see that the sheep do not get lost or killed.

Sometimes these dogs are trained to do other kinds of farm work. They earn the right to be called good helpers, too.

(Can you think of one other kind of work dog? He does not need a coat or strong legs like the sheep dog's. He does not learn to work with a sled in the deep, cold snow. He does not learn to be a farm worker.

He learns to help the man who cannot see. This dog must be of kind and wise. He must help the man do many things. He must stay by right beside the man day and night. He must learn to see for the man. Sometimes he must learn for the man, too.
Appendix K
UNDERSTANDING READING FLUENCY HANDOUT
Understanding Reading Fluency

Task 1

Purpose: To develop a personal conception of fluency

Setting: Form groups of 2 or 3

Procedures:
1. Brainstorm major features of fluency by creating a list. (assign a recorder) - 5 min
2. Create a graphic organizer from your list. - 5 min
3. Share with one other group (more if time) - 5 min
4. Revise organizer if you wish.
5. Hand in quiz to Niles.

Resources: your members of your group, notes book

Task 2

Purpose: To develop skill in analyzing pupil fluency

Setting: In dyads (24)

Procedures:
1. Using Rob’s reading, note errors in the majorly using tally marks and compile all information.
2. Compare your responses to at least one other group and indicate similarities and differences on the form provided. Finally give reasons for differences.

Task 3a
Identify important features of fluency
See handout
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Appendix L
ANALYSIS OF ROB'S READING
No grade level passage

Rob is entering 2nd grade. Ms. Curie likes to find out about the fluency of each of her readers at the beginning of the year. So she had Rob read this passage about sheep and dogs.

Sheep

Sheep work hard on a farm. They must learn to take sheep from place to place. They must see that the sheep do not run away. And they must see that the sheep do not get lost or killed. Sometimes these dogs are trained to do other kinds of farm work. They earn the right to be called good helpers, too.

Worker

Can you think of one other kind of work dog? He does not need a coat or strong legs like the sheep dogs. He does not learn to walk work with a sled in the deep, cold snow. He does not learn to be a farm worker.

Men

He learns to help men who cannot see. This dog must be kind and wise. He must help the man do many things. He must stay right beside the man day and night. He must learn to see for the man. Sometimes he must learn for the man, too.

Total

# Changed meaning miscues 24

# Corrected AC miscues

# Unchanged meaning miscues
Appendix M
HANDOUT FOR IMPORTANT FEATURES OF FLUENCY
What are important features? (2A Handout)

1. What was level of difficulty?

2. What sight word miscues were made?

3. What word identification miscues did he make?

4. What evidence of monitoring (self-correction) was apparent?

5. What other important features did you see?

**Instructional Judgments related to fluency**

1. Is this appropriate difficulty level material?

2. What are other judgments you might make about speed:
   - Sight vocabulary
   - Word identification
   - Monitoring
   - Other

**Instructional Decisions**

1. What instructional decisions might you make to help this student?

2. What questions do you still have about this student?
Comparing and Contrasting

Group I

Diff

Similarities

Group II

Difference

Reasons: for similarities and differences
Appendix N
UNDERSTANDING VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT HANDOUT
Understanding Vocabulary Development

I. Write a definition for:
   distinction, analogous, lexicon, vocabulary, word

II. Concept Building Task (in small groups)
    Procedures:
    1. Generate a list of as many words as you can that relate to vocabulary.
    2. Compare your list to one other group and make a master list you like.
    3. Take master list and group the words (associations) into categories. Make sure you label (name) the categories.
    4. Share your system with one other group (more if time).
    5. Define Vocabulary - write definition

Field Assignment #5

During this week, observe instances of the development of vocabulary at the word or conceptual level. Record several examples of these instances. Then write a reaction which includes your perception of the influence on the learner(s) and influence on your thinking about vocabulary instruction.
Appendix O
HANDOUTS FOR NARRATIVE AND EXPOSITORY TEXT
CLASS TASKS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONS

PURPOSE: To create text appropriate Questions for the assessment of reading comprehension.

Procedures:
1. Read the owl passage.
2. Create questions for the story using the narrative work sheet.
3. Compare your questions to another group’s for similarities and differences.
4. Revise your questions if necessary.

Procedures for expository passage.
1. Read the nest.
2. Use the work sheet to create the main idea, an outline, and accompanying questions.
3. At each step of the way compare your work with a colleague group.

Field Assignment 6

Grades 1 and 2: Select a child to read the two passages we used in class and have the child answer the questions your group generated. Select another child (similar in reading ability) and have him retell you what he read. Do not ask him specific questions; you may ask him/her "can you tell me any more about that. Please audiotape the interaction.

All other grades: Select a passage of any length and have the child listen or read it, orally or silently. Have them retell you what they have read. Audiotape it please.

ALL GRADES SHOULD BRING AUDIOTAPES TO CLASS ALONG WITH A COPY OF THE TEXT THE CHILD HAS READ. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE ASSIGNMENT.
DEVELOPING QUESTIONS FOR NARRATIVE MATERIAL

STORY STRUCTURE QUESTIONS

Setting

Initiating Event/Problem

Internal Reaction

Action

Consequence
DEVELOPING QUESTIONS FOR EXPOSITORY TEXT

Main Topic:

Outline:

Questions
Appendix P
HANDOUTS FOR PORTFOLIO TASK
Building a Portfolio Task

Purpose: To build a concept of using a portfolio for the assessment of student work in reading and language arts and to create a workable model.

Subtask #1: Building a Concept of Portfolio

1. Read the two articles by Au & Wolf.
2. Talk in your grade level group about what a portfolio is.
3. Complete the Portfolio task response sheet.
4. Share your sheet with other grade levels.

Subtask #2: Designing a Portfolio - Field Assignment 9

1. Design a portfolio for your grade level.
2. Include a description of the contents, an explanation of why you chose these contents and an explanation of how you would operate and use your portfolio.

Subtask #3: Field Test

1. Field test your portfolio with the 3 focal children you selected.
2. Assemble the data from your field test.

Subtask #4: Evaluation

1. Write an evaluation of your portfolio which considers at least:
   a. The appropriateness of the contents of your portfolio.
   b. The procedures you used.
   c. The overall management of the portfolio.
   d. Your overall reaction of its strengths and weaknesses.
   e. Suggestions for improvement.

Final Project should include:

1. Your individual conception of a portfolio.
2. A description of your portfolio.
3. The results of your field test.
4. Your evaluation of your portfolio.
5. Summary of what you have learned about portfolio assessment of reading and language arts.
Portfolio Response Sheet

What is it?

What are features of it?
1.
2.
3.
4.

What is it like?
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

9.
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