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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Transforming Reform into Practice:
The Enactment of Standards-Based Teacher Preparation and University-School Partnerships in Clinical Practice Activity Settings

by

Deborah Napoli

Doctor of Education in Teaching and Learning

University of California, San Diego, 2010

Paula Levin, Chair

Those who work to prepare student teachers in the field have faced increasing demands due to the most recent reform effort to professionalize teacher education. Three notable changes brought about by the professionalization movement are: (1) standards-based professional education, (2) state mandated teacher performance assessments, and (3) the increase in collaboration between the K-12 schools and the teacher preparation institutions. Little is known about the ways in which the expectations related to
professionalization are enacted in clinical practice activity settings. The broad question asked in this study is: How are state and university expectations for clinical practice in teacher education enacted through the patterns of communication and the use of assessment tools in a clinical practice group? Four clinical practice groups, each made up of the student teacher and those that observe, mentor, and evaluate that student teacher in the field, were examined in this study. The use of Activity Theory as a conceptual lens through which to examine clinical practice allowed for a focus on the social, not individual, aspects of the setting. Overall, the professional teaching standards were found to guide the evaluation of student teacher performance; however the evaluation tools were sometimes used in ways other than required by those who created them, thus privileging particular standards over others. Also, classroom management issues were found to permeate communication about performance while balanced discussions concerning professional teaching standards were less common. Patterns found in the partnership groups signaled movement toward increased collaboration to develop a shared understanding of evaluation tools. However, the outcome for school and university personnel to work together to develop, implement, and evaluate the clinical practice program was not found within the groups’ activities. A discussion of these findings from an Activity Theory perspective suggests that particular elements of the clinical practice setting may have influenced the enactment of state and university outcomes during clinical practice.
Chapter 1-Introduction

Effective classroom teaching requires a complex set of skills. Highly qualified teachers are expected to possess extensive subject-matter knowledge, design and implement appropriate pedagogical strategies, and meet difficult performance demands in the classroom. Programs charged with the responsibility of preparing highly qualified teachers face a difficult task. In order for these programs to be successful, it is important to understand the most effective ways to carry out teacher preparation.

In 1992, Feiman-Nemser and Parker predicted “as large numbers of new teachers are hired to meet growing needs and to fill gaps created by unprecedented amounts of retirement and high rates of attrition in the early years of teaching, serious attention to training, induction and mentoring will become even more critical” (p. 28). Teacher education programs have indeed experienced a recent increase in attention from educational reformers and policy makers in the form of mandates that increase expectations for teacher licensure and program accountability. It is critical to understand how these expectations relate to the successful preparation of highly qualified teachers for our nation’s classrooms.

Why Clinical Practice?

In a broad study of teacher education institutions in the United States, Goodlad, Soder, and Sirotnik (1990) reported a great deal of diversity among the requirements and practices across preservice programs. However, one of the most consistent similarities was the requirement that students complete a period of clinical practice in a classroom as a student teacher. During clinical practice, student teachers are typically assigned an
experienced classroom teacher. The regular classroom teacher is expected to allow the student teacher to assume many of the responsibilities of the classroom including planning, management, and instruction. This teacher acts as both mentor and evaluator of the student teacher. In most cases, the student teacher is observed, mentored and evaluated by the regular classroom teacher and a university supervisor.

Student teaching has been identified as the most influential element of teacher preparation by both researchers and experienced teachers alike (Clift, 1994; Cruickshank & Armaline, 1986; Koehler, 1988). However, Zeichner (1980) points out that simply placing a student teacher in a classroom with an experienced teacher does not necessarily benefit the student teacher’s learning. In some cases, he argues, field-based experiences serve to socialize teachers into the existing norms of teaching and learning and do not allow student teachers to practice the innovations taught at the university. Additionally, Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, and Watson (1998) found that after a decade of teacher education reform efforts by the Holmes Group, one of the areas of least progress was the articulation of learning goals for student teachers. Darling-Hammond (2006) echoes these sentiments writing, “Often, the clinical side of teacher education has been fairly haphazard, depending on the idiosyncrasies of loosely selected placements with little guidance about what happens in them and little connection to university work” (p. 308). It is within this context that the quality of clinical practice experiences have emerged as a major area of concern with researchers (McIntyre, Byrd & Foxx, 1996; Zeichner, 2002) calling for an increase in the body of knowledge of clinical practice as an element of teacher preparation programs.

One challenge in studying clinical practice in teacher education is the inclusion of
the multiple factors that constitute these settings. A review of the research on student teaching shows that clinical practice has frequently been studied in terms of isolating one factor and measuring the influence of that factor on the mentors or student teacher. Often missing from this research is a methodology that allows the researcher to consider how multiple factors relate to the process of preparing a student teacher.

**Why Now?**

The movement to professionalize teacher education is the current reform effort most affecting the contexts in which teacher candidates are prepared. Although professionalization has a long history in educational reform and is surrounded by controversy, it has recently made gains in policy and practice that guides teacher training and certification. It is important, therefore, to consider clinical practice in teacher education within the context of the major tenets of professionalization: the standards movement, mandatory performance assessments, and collaboration between teacher education institutions and the K-12 public school sites.

This study was designed to better understand how the reform effort to professionalize teacher education relates to the complex setting of student teacher clinical practice. The use of Activity Theory (Engeström, 2001), a conceptual lens powerful enough to account for this complexity, yielded findings that may have important implications for rethinking clinical practice so that it may become more effective in preparing highly qualified teachers. Grossman, Smagorinsky, and Valencia (1999) remind us that “after all, changing settings is much more possible than changing hosts of individuals. Identifying consequences of different activity settings can help generate
hypotheses about effective preservice settings” (p. 24). As reform efforts continue to impact teacher education in general and clinical practice settings in particular, it becomes even more important to understand how requirements and expectations resulting from reform policy impact the settings in which teacher education takes place.
Chapter 2-Review of the Literature

Two bodies of literature inform the design of this study. The first set of studies relates to the reform movement to professionalize teacher education. A review of this literature reveals that policies related to professionalization are currently changing the ways teachers are prepared. The second body of research examines clinical practice in teacher education. Studies in this field typically focus on individual beliefs and characteristics of student teachers and those who work with them in the field. Missing from this literature are studies that examine the complex social interactions and settings in which clinical practice are embedded. Overall, a review of these two bodies of literature points to the need for current research to focus on ways in which the professionalization reform effort is enacted within the complex social settings where clinical practice takes place.

The Professionalization of Teacher Education

Researchers, policy makers, and educators alike have begun to respond to the need for an improved teacher workforce that can simultaneously fill the vacancies caused by high rates of retirement and attrition and can effectively teach a growing population of students from diverse backgrounds with complex learning needs. One such response is the recommendation to professionalize teaching in order to attract and train the best and the brightest teacher candidates and to encourage self-regulation, autonomy, collaboration, and the development of a well-defined knowledge base among practicing teachers.
Cochran-Smith and Fries (2001) describe the professionalization effort as a way to “develop a consistent approach to teacher education nationwide based on high standards for the initial preparation, licensing, and certification of teachers” (p. 3). This stance has taken hold in educational policy resulting in three major recommendations for teacher education: (1) standards-based teacher preparation, (2) mandated teacher performance assessments, and (3) formal collaborative relationships between universities and school sites.

**A History of Professionalization in Education**

Popkewitz (1994) claims that the recent movement to professionalize teaching and teacher education is rooted in early reports such as *A Nation At Risk*, a 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education which described a crisis in education in the United States. He argues that this report led to a series of reform proposals in the 1980’s that were concerned with improving education by defining a knowledge base for teaching. The most popular and influential of these reform proposals include: the Holmes Group’s *Tomorrow’s Teachers* (1986); the Carnegie Forum’s *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986); and The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future’s (NCTAF) *What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future* (1996). Popkewitz asserts that these proposals contained “a central rhetoric…related to the professionalization of teaching” (p. 1). Burbules and Densmore (1991) give credence to this claim by indicating that the words *professional* or *profession* appear 46 times in the first nine pages of the Holmes Group report, *Tomorrow’s Teachers*. Popkewitz describes this rhetoric as centering on issues of teacher autonomy, privilege, and status. In his description of these reports, Zeichner (1991) similarly notes
the calls for the improved status of classroom teachers by giving them more power to make decisions and work together.

The effort to professionalize teaching requires, in part, the reinvention of teacher preparation programs. Following the publication of the reform reports of the 1980’s teacher education programs began to shift the ways in which prospective teachers are trained. For example, the development and use of professional teaching standards to guide the instruction and assessment of teacher candidates became more prominent (Kraft, 2001). Darling-Hammond (2006) claims that the reform reports from the 1980’s also recommend that universities become partners with the school sites where clinical practice takes place in order to “press for mutual transformations of teaching and learning to teach” (p. 302). The major recommendations for this reform, therefore, include the need for standards-based teacher preparation and an increased collaboration between schools and teacher training institutions.

**The Professionalization Debate**

One of the liveliest discussions in teacher education concerns ways to reform the system to attract and train the brightest and most talented teachers. Although the effort to professionalize teacher education has made the most progress in policy and practice thus far, some argue against this philosophy as the best way to achieve status, autonomy, and overall excellence in education.

**The Argument Against Professionalization**

Most experts who argue against the use of the term *profession* for teachers do not wish to deny teachers more salary or status, nor do they argue against the training and
maintenance of a well-qualified teacher workforce. Instead, some of these opponents have concerns about the definition and historical patterns of professions and the ability of professionalization to solve some of education’s most pressing problems. Other opponents contend that increased requirements and control of teacher training and credentialing might serve as a barrier to attracting the best and the brightest into the field. These experts call for the deregulation of teacher education.

Eisenstein (1972), sensing the swelling momentum in favor of professionalization, attempts to demonstrate that a movement toward teaching as a profession would undermine the relationships that teachers are supposed to have both with their students and with the communities in which they work. Eisenstein claims that professions by definition attempt to socially distance themselves from their clients as a way to guard their expertise and status. He argues that the proposed professional direction would further alienate the students and parents and prevent them from becoming involved in public education. Eisenstein is also concerned with the conservative nature of professions and how this conservative nature might make the necessary radical reforms more difficult. In other words, the traditional tendency of professionals – to control the recruitment and training process as well as socialize new recruits into the norms of the profession – would be counterproductive to the need for change in public education.

Burbules and Densmore (1991) address the more modern tenets of the professionalization movement by describing the current reformers’ efforts to create a “new professionalism” or a new set of concepts regarding professionalization that would apply to teaching and bypass the more conservative and historical tendencies of professions. The authors assert that the use of the term “profession” to describe the
occupation of teaching is neither an accurate nor attainable goal. They argue that the sociological and historical evidence of the emergence of a profession cannot be applied to teaching. Their evidence includes the fact that the development of the characteristics of a profession result from a successful political struggle to legitimize an occupation’s privileges, status, and salary. Burbules and Densmore claim that the occupation of teaching cannot pick and choose from a list of these characteristics in order to call themselves a profession and demand legitimization. Instead teachers must first win political and societal acceptance of teaching as a profession. Additionally, the authors contend that the characteristics of professions such as law and medicine are in constant flux, and teachers would be attempting to choose from a set of dynamic characteristics as a starting place instead of allowing the characteristics to emerge after a historically and socially defined political struggle to become legitimate. In other words, the making of a profession does not rest on the creation of an organizational model that dictates certain characteristics, but is a process resulting from social circumstances.

Ballou and Podgursky (1997) add to the argument against professionalization by pointing out that little empirical evidence suggests that professional standards and assessment, institutional accreditation, and stricter licensing requirements improve teacher quality. They assert that these requirements will serve to deter talented people from choosing teaching as a career, especially those who would choose teaching as a second career. Ballou and Podgursky believe that undergraduate students who work hard to complete rigorous majors will not be attracted to the increased requirements and training to become teachers. Essentially, the authors argue that professionalization would eliminate all individuals who have not chosen teaching as their career early in their
undergraduate work or as their first career, therefore weakening the number of content experts in the teaching pool.

Finally, Eisenstein (1972) takes issue with unionization of teaching as contrary to the accepted view of what is means to be a profession. He argues that teachers need to have the status and power to protect and control themselves independent of unions if they wish to be considered professional. Even Shanker (1985), a proponent of professionalization, recognized that collective bargaining could become an obstacle to the goal of creating a professional teacher workforce. He addressed the NY State United Teachers, AFT, and AFL-CIO in 1985 to take up this issue with the union leaders themselves.

Those in opposition to the professional movement in education tend to focus on historical notions of what it means to be a professional in the United States, building their arguments from a somewhat elitist foundational perspective. They seem to distrust a system that could attract highly qualified individuals and rigorously train and prepare them to meet the challenge of the diverse classrooms of today. Although the arguments presented here do hold some validity, the detractors do not offer many alternative solutions to the problems the educational system faces. They also tend to ignore the progressive sense of the word “professionalization” that supporters of the movement attempt to forward.

The Argument for Professionalization

Sykes, in the Introduction to the book titled *Teaching as a Learning Profession* (1999), writes:
The improvement of American education relies centrally on the development of a highly qualified teacher workforce imbued with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to encourage exceptional learning in all the nation’s students…the key to producing well-qualified teachers is to greatly enhance their professional learning across the continuum of a career in the classroom…Teaching par excellence must become the learning profession in order to stimulate greater learning among students (p. xv).

Shulman (1999), in the Foreword to the same text argues “…there remains no better strategy than a significant and sustained investment in well-educated professional teachers” (p. xii).

The professionalization of teaching is an important part of the larger reform effort to improve student learning and teacher quality in the United States. The professional teacher as defined by these scholars, is one who has gone through a rigorous training program that maintains high standards and has been assessed on his/her subject matter knowledge and performance in real classroom situations (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Shanker, 1985; Zeichner, 1991). The professional teacher is collaborative and constantly defining and improving upon the knowledge base needed for teacher expertise (Shanker, 1985). The proponents of professionalization have addressed the arguments mentioned above and maintain the position that the claims made in the reform reports in the 1980’s are still valid and important.

Sykes (1991), for example, argues that the historical and sociological evidence of a profession presented by Burbules and Densmore (1991) is too narrow, and that the term profession has various meanings both historically and culturally. Sykes claims that there is no inevitable process at work in the formation of a profession. He uses the analogy of our governments’ system of checks and balances to claim that a professional teaching
force is part of a larger system where teachers have equal voice, prestige, and power to
determine the course of educational reform. Sykes argues that the professional teacher
would not alienate the student and parent in order to protect expertise, but rather would
understand herself to be on equal grounds with parents and community, and use her
professional status to gain more control where she has none. Darling-Hammond (2000)
echoes this sentiment when she states that higher standards, as part of the
professionalization movement, will ensure that all students have better teachers who are
well equipped to respond to the learning needs of all students.

against professionalization by citing the substantial empirical evidence which suggests
that standards focused on pedagogical training and performance assessments improve
student learning and attrition rates. She questions the limited research reviewed by
Ballou and Podgursky and the accuracy of the research they interpret. Darling-Hammond
also refutes the argument that professionalization will deter qualified people who might
enter the teaching profession. She identifies studies that show teachers with little
professional preparation feel less prepared to handle the complex dynamics in the
classroom, are rated lower by principals, supervisors, and colleagues, and tend to leave
teaching at higher than average rates.

Finally, Shanker (1985), another proponent of professionalization, agreed that it
might be considered unprofessional for teachers to attempt to improve their salaries and
work conditions through unionization. Shanker recommends that collective bargaining
for points such as better pay and lower class sizes is still necessary, but that unions must
work in harmony with teachers and professional teacher organizations to help the
occupation become a profession.

Proponents of the effort to professionalize teaching and teacher education argue that professionalization is a means to several ends. It will afford teachers the prestige, salary, status, and control that will both attract the best and the brightest into the profession, and improve the quality of teaching and learning that our students so badly need. Professionalization will broaden the knowledge base of what teachers need to be able to know and do as the landscape of public education continually changes and challenges educators. It will encourage collaboration universities and school sites and within the schools themselves.

Fullan (1993) wrote about teacher education as “society’s missed opportunity,” and said it was simultaneously the “worst problem and the best solution in education.” In 1998, Fullan et al., in an independent report on the progress of the teacher educational reform movement that started in the 1980’s, stated that the movement known as professionalization had “stalled.” In the decade since Fullan et al.’s assessment of the movement to professionalize teaching, some of the policies and practices associated with this movement are alive and well. For example, national and state organizations continue to develop and use professional teaching standards, state mandated teacher performance assessments are on the rise, and universities and schools continue to collaborate in the training of student teachers in the field.

Summary

Regardless of the political debate, the current effort to reform teacher education is buoyed by the rhetoric of professionalization that came out of the 1980’s along with the tenets of standards-based teaching and learning, performance assessments based on these
standards, and the collaboration between schools and universities that have become the hallmarks of the professionalization effort.

**The Major Components of Professionalization in Teacher Education**

The initial recommendations stemming from reports such as The Holmes Group’s *Tomorrow’s Teachers* (1986) laid the foundation for the most recent reforms in teacher education. The following section focuses on those recommendations that have made the greatest impact on policy and practice in teacher education.

**The Nationwide Standards and Performance Assessment Movement**

Kraft (2001) argues that national standard setting in teacher education dates back to 1925 when the American Association of Teachers Colleges formed, and with the subsequent formation in 1950 of the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Although standard setting for teacher education is not a novel idea, it has reemerged as a cornerstone in the current movement to professionalize teaching. Several reports commissioned as a response to *A Nation at Risk* have influenced the standards movement and performance assessment model for the past three decades.

These reports led directly to the formation of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Council (INTASC). These groups, along with NCATE, worked together to create complementary systems of national standards and procedures for the continuum of teacher education including accreditation, licensing of new teachers, and the advanced certification of experienced teachers. In 2001, approximately half of all teacher education programs were seeking NCATE accreditation (Kraft, 2001). Two sets of
national standards provide guidance for new teacher education programs across the
country: the NCATE Standards for accreditation of teacher preparation institutions and
the INTASC standards for the licensing of new teachers. On the other hand, the National
Board for Professional Teaching Standards focuses on standards for advanced
certification for teachers who have been in the classroom at least three years.

Each of these groups believes that teachers should demonstrate mastery of state
and national standards during instructional performance in a classroom setting. Testing
teachers in order to gain licensure is not a new practice, but these tests have historically
included paper and pencil multiple-choice format that do not prove what a teacher is able
to do with her knowledge in the classroom. Darling-Hammond (1986) asserts that the
multiple-choice tests do not account for context, represent knowledge and demonstration
of standards, or help to define a professional knowledge base for teaching. Standards-
based performance assessments were designed in part to address these concerns. There
are two functions of professional tests that assess performance, according to Darling-
Hammond. One function is to create a measure of selectivity for entrance into teaching
as a career. The other function is to define a professional knowledge base for teaching.
Darling-Hammond claims that when teacher tests can “reflect a view of the professional
knowledge base that is flexible, context specific, and can tolerate multiple approaches
and perspectives, teaching will become a profession with a claim to authority in the
decisions that shape teaching work” (p. 46).

Current trends in teacher education towards standards and performance
assessments are controversial among teacher educators and policy makers, but have
nonetheless been included in recent legislation, especially in California.
Standards and Performance Assessments in California

The current push in California toward professional standards and assessment of performance stems from both the national crisis described in *A Nation at Risk* and more recent test score data indicating that California students were falling behind their peers both nationally and internationally (Russell, 2006).

Research of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) on teacher preparation led to the recommendation of a set of standards, support, and authentic assessment for all new teachers in California. This recommendation led the California Department of Education to award WestEd (then called the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development) a contract to create the draft framework of the standards. In 1992 Senate Bill 1422 authorized the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program to implement the systems of support and assessment of all new teachers. The draft framework of the standards became known as the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) (see Appendix A).

Using surveys and focus groups, a validity study of the BTSA framework and standards was conducted from 1995 to 1997. One important finding was the inconsistency in teachers’ and support providers’ conceptual understanding of the underlying constructs and terminology of the standards (Whittaker, 2001). This validity study led to revisions and the official publication of the CSTP.

Then in 1997, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) published a report titled, *California’s Future: Highly Qualified Teachers for all Students*. The report indicated that with the adoption of the standards “professionalism could now be fostered in the state” (p. 6).
In 1998, California Senate Bill 2042 accelerated the effort to professionalize teacher education by requiring the use of standards for preservice teachers and mandating that all candidates for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials pass an assessment of teaching performance based on these standards. The CCTC was charged with creating these standards as well as developing and implementing a statewide performance assessment. In 2001 the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) were adopted by the CCTC and were meant to guide preservice teacher education. The 13 TPEs are aligned within the six domains of teaching that appear in the CSTP framework. By 2008, the deadline for implementation of the new performance assessment, the CCTC had approved three performance assessments to be used statewide. The first was the CalTPA, developed by the Educational Testing Service in conjunction with CCTC. The other approved assessments include the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), and the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST).

The year of my study (2009) was the first year that California teacher candidates have been required to pass one of these performance assessments in order to receive their credential. Some teacher preparation programs had begun to incorporate the performance assessment into the coursework before this date. But for many of the state’s teacher education programs, this change was dramatic. This shift in requirements warrants a close look at the impact of the policy on the everyday business of training teacher candidates.

*Collaborative Efforts Between Universities and K-12 Schools*

The reform movement to professionalize teaching included a recommendation for K-12 schools and teacher preparation programs to collaborate in the preservice teacher
training as well as induction and professional development. The Holmes Group Report (1990) was the first to use the term Professional Development School (PDS) to describe the type of collaboration in teacher education between K-12 schools and teacher training institutions. According to the Holmes Group, collaboration in education should model itself after the teaching hospital in the medical profession.

The first principle of the PDS as stated in the Holmes Group report is “reciprocity, or mutual exchange and benefit between research and practice” (p. 53). Fullan et al. (1998), in their study of the Holmes Group reforms, indicate that the PDS movement made significant progress in the 10 years since its inception. Fullan et al. are careful to note, however, that their visits of the PDS sites indicated that the reciprocity stated in the original document was not necessarily occurring in these institutions. They report that although school leaders were informed of curricular decisions, the university was clearly the authority and decision-making body.

More recent studies draw the same conclusions about the nature of university-school partnerships both in a PDS setting and in other collaborative contexts. For example, Edwards and Mutton (2007) in a large-scale study of collaborative partnerships in England found that schools did not see themselves as partners, but as institutions working within a system of bureaucratic procedures and paperwork with universities. Nevertheless, the trend of collaborative partnerships continues to be recommended in the literature as a possible solution to the ambiguities that surround field-based experiences for preservice teachers. Cochran-Smith (1991), in an elegant review of “reinvented” student teacher programs, creates a new framework to examine the ways universities and schools work together to train student teachers in the field. She concludes that the most
effective and synergistic programs work within a model she terms “collaborative resonance. Within this model, the combined experience of both the school and the university create richer learning experiences than either could provide individually.

One indication that this trend has taken hold is the language contained in the standards for the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Specifically, Standard 3, titled *Field Experiences and Clinical Practice*, states as its first requirement the “Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners.” The target practice is described as:

The school and unit share and integrate resources and expertise to support candidates’ learning in field experiences and clinical practice. Both unit and school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit’s conceptual framework(s) and the school program; they each participate in the unit’s and the school partners’ professional development activities and instructional programs for candidates and for children. The unit and its school partners jointly determine the specific placements of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to maximize the learning experience for candidates and P-12 students (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2009).

Many studies that examine university/school collaborative efforts offer insights into organizational learning (Callahan & Martin, 2007; Friedman, 2006), describe the effects of collaboration on cooperating teachers and student teachers (Beck & Kosnik, 2002), or look at the effect of collaboration on important teaching skills such as inquiry and reflection (Rodgers & Keil, 2007). Castle, Fox, and Souder (2006) conducted a qualitative study comparing PDS and non-PDS teacher candidates by examining their standards-based evaluations. Missing from this body of literature are studies that provide a rich description of the daily interactions among members of the student teaching team in both collaborative and non-collaborative contexts, and how these interactions affect
student teacher learning in terms of the standards and assessments used to measure progress.

Summary

Overall, the movement to professionalize teacher education has made deep inroads in policy and practice. Most teacher credentialing programs nationwide now engage in standards-based teacher education and assessment, and university-school partnerships are on the rise.

A Review of the Research on Clinical Practice in Teacher Education

The research in this review was organized into categories according to the types of questions examined. The categories included research on student teacher beliefs and reflective practices, mentoring roles and types of support, power and control relationships, and collaborative partnerships between universities and school sites. A review of these studies revealed several limitations in ways these studies account for the complex interactions, use of resources, and expectations.

A Brief History of Clinical Practice in the United States

Education in America before the early 1800’s took place in a variety of settings; a teacher might have been a parent, preacher, neighbor, or tutor depending on the setting. In the 1830’s an organized system of elementary schools emerged and were operated by local public officials. Teachers became public employees. During this time the criteria to become a teacher was the successful completion of the level of education at which you taught (Labaree, 2008).
The notion of formalized teacher education began when these elementary schools created the need for large numbers of teachers within a short period of time. Normal schools (schools dedicated to setting the standard or “the norm” for teacher training) emerged and took the place of the informal apprenticeship model in which those who wanted to teach simply found an experienced teacher from which to learn (Hughes, 1982). Normal schools transformed into teacher colleges and eventually to state universities. The locus of control over teacher education had moved to the university by the early 1900’s.

According to Goodlad, Soder, and Sirotnik (1990), field experience, or time spent by teachers-in-training in public classrooms, has always been a part of teacher education in the university setting. Zeichner and Conklin (2008) describe these field experiences as varied over time and among different programs. The authors outline several differences that existed in the field experience component of teacher education programs including semester long requirements, year-long internships, field experiences woven throughout the program, and field experiences only at the end of the required course of study. They report that some field settings required working in a classroom while others involved experiences with adults and children in the community.

Typically, university-based teacher education fieldwork took place after a period of initial coursework at the university and observations of local K-12 classrooms (Goodlad et al., 1990). A teacher candidate was then placed with an experienced full time classroom teacher, often called a cooperating teacher. During this field experience the teacher candidate was also considered a student teacher, although student teaching was only one component of a teacher education program. Student teachers were not
typically paid for their time teaching in the classroom. The cooperating teacher’s role ranged from relinquishing their teaching responsibilities to the student teacher to being a co-teacher or coach. Often the university gave the cooperating teachers the responsibility of evaluating the student teacher by requiring weekly progress reports, midterm or final evaluations, and/or narratives of performance. In addition, a university supervisor was assigned to observe, coach, and evaluate. The frequency of these visits varied across institutions. University supervisors also held post-observation conferences with the student teachers to discuss areas that needed improvement. The university program usually dictated the number of times and types of evaluations conducted by the supervisor. The university and state also dictated the requirements for the student teacher. Evaluations included university-designed rubrics, observation forms, and progress reports.

Most states currently require a standard assessment of performance. Additionally, the student teacher usually is enrolled in university courses during their student teaching placement. These courses continue the student teachers’ understanding of research-based best practices in the classroom and help them through challenges during their placements.

**Research on Clinical Practice in Teacher Education**

**Research on Student Teacher Beliefs about Teaching and Learning**

Student teachers’ beliefs change during the time they are learning to teach, and the literature cites several reasons for this phenomenon. Wood (2000) found that student teachers began their practice in the field with a focus on themselves and not the students. His research revealed that this conception changes with time to a focus on the learner.
He attributes an innovative program curriculum focused on K-12 student learning as the central variable affecting this change. Solmon and Ashy (1995) found that student teacher beliefs about instruction and student learning change due to their own lack of skill, knowledge, or talent in implementing instructional strategies that these beliefs dictate. They offer these findings to explain why policy-makers see teacher education programs as ineffective in preparing and maintaining a highly qualified teacher workforce. Nettle (1998) found that a cooperating teacher’s philosophies and beliefs about education contribute to changes in the student teacher’s fundamental beliefs about teaching and learning because the cooperating teacher “socializes” the student teacher into these beliefs. In contrast to Nettle’s study on changing beliefs, Borko and Mayfield (1995) found that the cooperating teachers did not affect changes in the student teachers’ underlying philosophies about education but rather only affected how student teachers think about more technical aspects of instruction such as classroom management strategies and assessment design.

Overall, studies in this area reveal that many factors contribute to teacher candidates’ changing beliefs about teaching while practicing in the field. These include the influence of program curriculum, cooperating teachers and university supervisors, and the influence of the student teachers’ own abilities, knowledge, and skill level as they begin teaching.

*Research on Student Teacher Reflective Practice*

Encouraging teachers to be reflective practitioners is a trend in teacher education that began as the standards movement in education started to take hold and teacher education accreditation requirements became a focus of research and policy (Freese,
1999; McIntyre, et al., 1996). As defined by Schön (1996), reflective practice is thoughtful consideration of one's own experiences in applying knowledge to practice while being mentored by more senior members of the profession. Some studies look at how the characteristics of reflection change with time and experience. For example, Jenkins, Garn, and Jenkins (2005) explored what student teachers notice about their own and others’ teaching over time. They found that the more exposure student teachers had to other teachers’ instruction, the more sophisticated were their reflections and comments and the greater their ability to connect theory to practice. Studies by Copeland (1994) and Allen (2000) support Jenkins et al. by concluding that expert teachers reflect on what happens in the classroom in more depth than novice teachers. Overall, the researchers found that the frequency and depth of reflection increases as teachers gain experience.

Other studies on student teacher reflection consider the factors that aid or hinder the development of reflective practice. Freese (1999) found that the explicit teaching and assessment of reflection during coursework might help student teachers reflect more frequently in the field. Clarke (1995) and Sewall (2007) discovered that during supervision conferences, student teacher reflection could increase by using student teacher selected videos of their own teaching performance and allowing the student teacher to be in charge of the conversation about the video. This structure is referred to as video-elicited reflection. In other words, the student teacher decides what they believe is relevant to discuss while the supervisor serves as a facilitator to the student teachers’ reflection instead. Their findings indicate that the student teachers reflect more often during a conference organized in this way.
Halter (2006) examined how student teachers’ scores on a performance-based assessment were affected by video-elicited reflection. Halter found that scores on the reflection section of the student teachers’ performance assessments were higher when using a video of the novice teacher’s instruction to draw out reflective talk from the novice teacher. Therefore the outcome as defined by the university and state were met in the area of reflection through the use of video-elicited reflection.

Overall, these studies show that explicit coursework instruction that creates opportunities for reflective experiences along with time in the classroom setting can increase reflective practice in novice teachers. Also, the type of post-lesson conferencing conducted by the university supervisor (such as video-elicited reflection) can increase the amount of reflection and help the student teacher meet state and university outcomes for reflective practice. The studies on reflection point to the importance of the mentoring and supervision practices of those involved with the preparing preservice teachers in the field.

Research on the Roles and Responsibilities of Mentors

A common concern expressed by university supervisors and cooperating teachers who mentor student teachers in the field is their confusion about their own roles and responsibilities (Slick, 1998). In the research literature, this uncertainty has been found to negatively affect the student teaching experience.

Sanders, Dowson, and Sinclair (2005) compared the espoused functions of the university supervisor and cooperating teacher to the enacted behaviors that occur in the field. The functions of these roles, as defined in mentor literature, include curriculum planner, model teacher, observer, evaluator, dialoguer/discussant, professional peer,
counselor, and friend. They found that mentors reported difficulty in understanding and synthesizing these espoused roles, and they often did not understand, balance, or practice these roles with student teachers. Bullough (2005) and Slick (1997, 1998) explored possible reasons for these difficulties. Through interviews with the cooperating teachers and university supervisors they found that it may result in part from the lack of support and guidance offered by the institutions in which the mentors work.

Research on Types of Support and Mentoring

The studies that asked questions about the most effective mentoring strategies seem to show that trust and positive support are important to ensure that student teachers are prepared to enter the profession. For instance, Tang and Chow (2007) found that student teachers perceive they have learned productively when they experience helpful and encouraging contact with many teaching professionals. Awaya, McEwan, Heyler, Linsky, Lund, and Wakukawa (2003) discovered that student teachers report they learn best when they receive constructive criticism accompanied by positive reinforcement. Osam and Balbay (2004) studied student teacher decision-making strategies and the influence of a negative relationship between the student teacher and cooperating teacher. According to the authors, a negative relationship exists when the student teacher and cooperating teacher have difficulty communicating effectively about the student teacher’s weaknesses. They found that a student teacher’s decision making during lessons can sometimes be motivated by the relationship between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher instead of a logical pedagogical decision. They suggest that the cooperating teacher and student teacher need to see each other as partners in collaboration in order to help decision-making. Furthermore, Hsu (2005) examined the
relationship between mentor support and student teacher help-seeking behaviors. Hsu found that the student teachers will not turn to their university supervisors or cooperating teachers for help if they perceive that these mentors will not offer them positive support. Taskin (2006) found that the less the cooperating teachers interfered during instruction, and the more they trusted the student teacher, the more the student teachers felt that they learned. The patterns found by these researchers indicate that when mentors provide encouraging feedback and trust to student teachers, both mentors and student teachers believe that student teacher learning is enhanced.

Many studies also touch upon issues of control and power that exist among student teachers and cooperating teachers. These studies explore how the dynamics affect the relationships between these individuals and ultimately student teacher learning.

**Research on Control and Power During Clinical Practice**

Some of the research examines the relative influence and weight of competing agendas and demands as mentors and student teachers work together in the field. Researchers found effective student teacher learning takes place if steps are taken to mitigate conflicts that arise due to competing agendas. Graham (1999) found that student teachers feel caught in the middle of power struggles between cooperating teachers and university supervisors. He found that student teachers often feel placed in a position where they must side with one of their mentors. This struggle may result in the student teacher becoming a more passive and less risk-taking learner. Graham found that if the cooperating teacher and university supervisor share the belief that they are able to learn from each other’s areas of expertise, the negative effects of power dynamics on student teacher learning can be decreased.
Ritchie, Rigano, and Lowry (2000) deliberately tried to change the dynamic between student teachers and cooperating teachers by designing a structured interview activity where the student teacher takes control temporarily by being the interviewer. They found that reducing the power difference between cooperating teachers and student teachers could provide opportunities for learning to occur because the student teacher becomes an active learner. Similarly, Sewall (2007) reorganized post-lesson conferences to see what the effect might be on student reflection. She found that when novice teachers choose the content of the post-lesson conference topics, the mentor’s role shifts from the expert who controls the conversation to co-learner who facilitates the student teacher’s learning. As a result, the student teacher has more control over her own learning, control that supports reflection and growth.

These studies provide a more interactive view of the process of student teacher learning. They reveal that learning is positively affected when student teachers are given opportunities to decide who talks and what is talked about during their time practicing in the field. However, these studies are limited in two ways: they focus on issues of power and student teacher learning, and rely on individual self-reports, beliefs, and attitudes of people involved in preparation of student teachers.

*Research on University and School Site Partnerships*

Student teaching, like medical intern training, requires that students enter into organizations that are separate from their academic institutions in order to apply and practice learning in field. Thus, there must be some level of collaboration between the field site and the academic institution. There are many collaborative structures in place between university teacher preparation programs and the public schools in which they
place student teachers. At its most basic level, this collaboration includes the agreement made between the university and school regarding the conditions under which student teachers are placed. Other collaborations attempt to increase interaction by actively seeking model classroom teachers who are willing to mentor student teachers, by providing mentor training to classroom teachers, and by encouraging an open exchange of ideas and expertise between members of both organizations. Cochran-Smith (1991) defines the ideal collaboration as a synergistic one, meaning the outcome of working together produces a richer learning experience for all involved than either could produce alone.

One way these collaborative efforts have been formalized is through the Professional Development School (PDS). Research on the PDS model suggests that student teacher learning is positively affected in these formal collaborative settings. Ten Dam and Blom (2006) examined the relationship between student teacher learning in a PDS setting and the development of student teacher’s identity as a teaching professional. They found that the partnership setting did have a positive impact on the development of self-reported efficacy in student teachers. Mule (2006) sought to discover if PDS partnerships help student teachers engage in active reflection and inquiry about their own planning and instruction. Mule reported that students felt they engaged in inquiry in productive ways when learning in a PDS context. Castle et al. (2006) looked at student teacher scores on a performance-based assessment to determine if the PDS was accomplishing the goals of teacher preparation in the field. They found that, compared to students in a non-partnership context, the students trained in a PDS scored higher in four areas of the performance assessment: planning, instruction, management, and
assessment. This study is valuable in that it uses formal assessments of student teaching to measure learning rather than self-reports of learning.

When partnerships do not reach the level of mutual learning described as synergistic by Cochran-Smith, there is little impact on student teacher learning. Edwards and Mutton (2007) examined the PDS model in England and found that often the schools and universities were joined only by paperwork and procedure, which according to student teachers and their mentors did not significantly affect their experience in the field. Additionally, Goodlad (1993) found in a broad study of PDS contexts in the United States that student teacher learning was rarely improved due to collaboration because “…praxis in regard to school-keeping and teacher educating was rarely shared…between institutions” (p. 29).

Overall, the research on collaborative partnerships points to the conclusion that collaboration between the university and school site has the potential to benefit student teacher learning.

**Summary**

A review of the literature on the professionalization of teacher education reveals that despite a rigorous debate, efforts to professionalize teacher education are currently affecting the ways in which teachers are prepared. This warrants a closer look at the ways the professionalization effort is playing out in clinical practice settings.

This review also reveals that studies examining clinical practice tend to be based on self-reports that focus on the characteristics, attributes, behaviors, and beliefs of individuals working to mentor and evaluate student teachers. Overall, the studies
represent a limited view of the interactions between individuals and the use of resources that take place during student teaching as well as the contexts in which clinical practice is situated.

Recently, researchers examining clinical practice have begun to acknowledge these limitations. A few of the most recent teacher education clinical practice studies have begun to use a conceptual lens that is able to account for the social and contextual components of student teacher preparation. A brief review of these studies is included as part of the following discussion of the conceptual framework used to guide the design of this study.
Chapter 3-Conceptual Framework

Teacher preparation in a clinical practice setting involves multiple mentors who work with a student teacher using various conceptual and practical tools to prepare future teachers. The movement to professionalize teacher preparation has added several dimensions to this process including mandated teacher performance assessments, standards-based preparation, and university-school partnerships. The broad question of this study is: How are state and university expectations for clinical practice in teacher education, including standards-based preparation and university-school partnerships enacted in the patterns of communication and the use of assessment tools in a clinical practice group activity setting? Recent studies on clinical practice have drawn from Activity Theory in order to examine the complex settings in which student teachers are trained. I also drew upon concepts from Vygotsky’s social learning theory and its more recent instantiation, Activity Theory, in order to capture the complexities of learning and instruction in clinical practice settings.

The following is a brief overview of the development of Activity Theory from Vygotsky’s social learning theory. I focus in particular on the current generation of Activity Theory as defined by Engeström (1996) as well as Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), and Wertsch’s (1979) clarification of the ZPD using the construct of intersubjectivity. These three frameworks were central to the design and analysis stages of this project because they helped to construct and account for the teaching and learning processes that occur in clinical practice settings.
Vygotsky’s Theory of Social Learning

Russian psychologist Lev Semyonovich Vygotsky (1896-1934) developed a theory of individual development and learning that suggested all learning is social in nature (Vygotsky, 1978). This notion challenged basic assumptions of his time that all learning and development occurs inside of the individual as a function of the relationship between stimulus and response. Two major concepts of Vygotsky’s theory of social learning are most relevant for the design of this study, learning as a socially mediated process and the zone of proximal development (ZPD). I use this conceptual framework to examine the patterns of interaction and tool use within a clinical practice setting in order to understand how these patterns relate to the state and university requirements that stem from the professionalization movement.

Learning as a Socially Mediated Process

According to Wertsch (1985), Vygotsky was one of the first psychologists to think about the processes of development and learning as rooted in socially and culturally mediated activities. Vygotsky believed that tools and signs (such as language and material resources) used by cultures to accomplish goals are internalized by individuals, and through this process of internalization the individual is able to develop higher cognitive functioning such as abstract thought and problem solving. Vygotsky’s social learning theory (1978) differed from the behaviorist learning theory that favored a direct line between stimulus and response to explain human learning. Vygotsky (1978) suggested that this direct line was transcended by the internalization of socially created tools and signs.
This theory of learning can be expressed as a triad of subject, object, and mediating artifact. Figure 1 represents an activity that is socially mediated.

Figure 1: A Socially Mediated Activity

Thinking about student teaching from a Vygotskyian perspective means taking into consideration the cultural and social signs and tools that the student teacher internalizes in order to learn how to effectively teach. With this perspective on teaching and learning, I consider the ways in which individuals in clinical practice settings use assessment tools to mediate learning.

The Zone of Proximal Development and Intersubjectivity

Vygotsky’s concept of the “zone of proximal development” (ZPD) (1978) begins by presupposing that all learners have undergone previous development through the internalization of tools and signs. He called this initial stage the individual’s actual developmental level. He theorized that every individual also has a potential level of development, that is, the level of development that is possible through the help of a more
capable peer. *The distance between the actual and the potential levels of development in an individual is the zone of proximal development (ZPD).* Vygotsky further asserts that as the individual works within the ZPD she develops the ability to solve problems without the help of a more capable peer. This ability transforms the individual’s potential level of development into her new actual level of development.

In order to help clarify the ways in which development occurs within the ZPD, Wertsch (1979) uses the construct of intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity occurs within the ZPD when the actors have constructed a shared understanding of the overall goal of the setting, the actions taken, and tools used to reach the goal. This construction of shared understanding becomes particularly relevant in a clinical practice activity setting where the individuals from different communities (student teacher, cooperating teacher, university supervisor) often do not share the same understanding of the goals, actions, or tools within the setting. The requirements and expectations introduced into clinical practice settings due to reform efforts may additionally affect intersubjectivity among group members regarding the aim of the reform. According to the construct of ZPD, a mismatch in the understanding of these aspects of the activity could have a negative affect on the student teacher’s learning and development. The construct of intersubjectivity provided a rationale for and a way to examine the various perspectives that existed within one clinical practice setting and how these perspectives related to student teacher preparation.

**Activity Theory**

Vygotsky’s social learning theory serves as the core of Activity Theory.
Theory, also referred to as cultural historical Activity Theory (CHAT), builds on Vygotsky’s ideas by moving from individual activity to collective activity (Engeström, 2001). The central principle of Activity Theory is that human activity takes place within settings, each consisting of multiple actors working toward a goal. Within each setting the actors use tools to mediate the process of working toward the goal and to create meaning (Engeström, 2001). In order to examine a setting using Activity Theory, the actors, tools, goals, values, and cultural systems must be considered together and in relation to one another. Therefore, studies that rely on Activity Theory as a conceptual framework consider the setting the unit of analysis instead of the individual (Engeström, 2001). This approach is particularly useful when studying the settings in which student teachers practice teaching. Often in these settings, multiple mentors and evaluators work together to prepare the student teacher using resources from both the university program and the school site where the student teacher is practicing. The movement to professionalize the process of learning to teach has also affected the ways in which these settings function through the introduction of teaching standards, performance based assessments, and university-school partnerships. Understanding the ways these clinical practice activity settings function is critical for understanding the process of learning to teach and making meaningful and practical recommendations for future clinical practice settings.

**Three Generations of Activity Theory**

Engeström (1996) discusses the evolution of three generations of Activity Theory. The first generation centers on Vygotsky’s idea of mediated action as depicted in Figure
1. The notion of mediated action meant that individual behavior and development could only be understood in terms of his or her cultural setting.

Leont’ev (1978) initiated the second generation of Activity Theory as a result of the limitations of Vygotsky’s theory. Leont’ev saw the need to move beyond individual action to collective action. By using the collective primeval hunt as an example, Leont’ev was able to illustrate that an individual tribal member’s action of scaring the herd of animals toward the hunters was necessitated by his need for food or clothing. However, this individual’s action alone would not accomplish that purpose. It was instead the collective action of this member, the hunters, and other members of the tribe that would help attain the object of clothing and/or food for the member and the tribe. Engeström created a graphic (see Figure 2) that expanded upon Vygotsky’s notion of mediated activity to include Leont’ev’s ideas of collective activity.
The examination of student teaching using Activity Theory and the construct of an activity setting opens the view of student teaching to the complex social nature of the experience. Grossman, Smagorinsky, and Valencia (1999) make the case that this perspective is helpful in the field of teacher education:

Much of the research in teacher education has been focused on the individual teacher and has offered individualistic explanations for preservice teachers’ success or failure...A focus on social contexts, however, shifts attention from the individual to the setting. Changing settings is much more possible than changing hosts of individuals…Identifying the consequences of different activity settings can help generate hypotheses about effective preservice…settings (p. 24).

Similarly, Edwards and Protheroe (2004) argue that the actors’ characteristics alone cannot reveal much about the learning that takes place in a particular setting. Instead the actors, the mediating tools they are using, as well as the constructed outcome,
rules, division of labor, and community must be examined in light of each other. They make this claim after examining data from their previous study that looked at the ways in which mentors talk to student teachers and the subsequent effect on student teacher learning. Originally they found that the mentors’ methods were not effective. However, after reexamining data through the lens of Activity Theory they found that it was not necessarily the mentors acting alone that caused the problem, but the activity setting and how it “positioned” the mentors to talk the way they did to the student teachers. The authors focus on how the rules and the division of labor within the setting prove that the mentors had little choice about how to talk to their student teachers.

Smagorinsky, Jakubiak and Moore (2008) used Activity Theory in their case study of a student teacher in a vocational English class. Focusing on the student teachers’ use of pedagogical tools and how those tools were appropriated (where the student teacher was encouraged to use each tool), they discovered that the goals and motives of the most powerful people and groups have a greater influence on the student teacher’s selection of tools. Even though there may be more than one motive in a single activity setting, only those goals perceived as most powerful by the learner will guide learning.

Valencia, Martin, Place, and Grossman (2009) realized the importance of drawing upon Activity Theory in terms of including all voices in the examination of the student teacher’s development. Their four-year longitudinal study examining student teaching activity settings yielded the finding that all of the actors within the clinical setting (the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and student teacher) were constantly attempting to maneuver among the multiple and competing demands of the setting. For
example, they found that the student teachers spent a great deal of energy and time attempting to perform according to the contrasting demands of the university and school site. This finding is not new of course, however when understood in the context of the other members’ negotiation of their own roles and demands, it becomes clear that elements of the setting itself impose limitations and disruptions to each individual’s ability to effectively function within the setting. The authors argue that these constraints limit the student teachers’ opportunities to learn both pedagogy and content. The implications of these findings are very important, especially as the professionalization movement begins to add yet another dimension to the clinical practice setting.

Some researchers have examined aspects of the student teaching experience using the lens of Activity Theory to inform their studies on university-school partnerships. Edwards and Mutton (2007), Tsui and Lawa (2007), and Grossman et al. (1999) use the concepts of the boundary zone and boundary crossing to examine partnerships. Tuomi-Grohn, Engeström, and Young (2003) define the “boundary zone” as the place where two activity systems meet, and refer to boundary crossing as the ability for one activity system to adopt and share elements of another.

Edwards and Mutton (2007), Tsui and Lawa (2007), and Grossman et al. (1999) address the boundary crossing, or the mediating effects of the individuals’ movements back and forth between activity settings (the school site and the university) that occur during the preparation of teacher candidates. They found that the people in the organizations did not see themselves as sharing boundaries (adopting the elements of one another’s organizations), but rather as exchanging paperwork and procedures.
The studies that use Activity Theory to understand clinical practice look less at the individual’s attributes and behaviors and more at the wider social and contextual issues that influence these settings. Ultimately, this shift allows for a more inclusive examination of clinical practice that may lead to a more effective development and enactment of reform.

**The Application of Activity Theory in This Study**

This study was conceived using Leont’ev’s conception of collective activity in what Engeström (1996) describes as the second generation of activity. This instantiation of Activity Theory is applied to the present study of clinical practice groups (university supervisor, student teacher, cooperating teacher, district administrator) at the school site (see Figure 3). By using the lens of Activity Theory in this way, the clinical practice group setting becomes the unit of analysis. This lens allows for a more complex account of the processes involved in clinical practice and is powerful enough to include mediating tools that have been introduced into clinical practice such as standards and performance assessments.
Summary

The use of Activity Theory and the constructs of ZPD and intersubjectivity in this study allowed for the examination of the setting in which clinical practice takes place instead of a simplistic understanding of individual actions and beliefs. Included in the setting are the rules (expectations and requirements) related to the reform effort to professionalize teacher education.
Chapter 4-Methodology

Mertens (2005) states that educational research does not rely on one correct method for designing and implementing a study. As a result, she argues, the researcher must describe her methodology in detail to maintain validity and reliability. The methods I used to examine clinical practice settings in this study were informed by the tenets of Activity Theory and were driven by this construct as well as the main and sub-questions posed.

Research Questions

The broad question explored in this study is:

How are state and university expectations for clinical practice in teacher education, including standards-based preparation and university-school partnerships, enacted through the patterns of communication and the use of assessment tools in a clinical practice group activity setting?

In order to understand the ways in which the university and state expectations for clinical practice are instantiated in the clinical practice groups’ activities, it is first necessary to describe the patterns of communication and use of assessment tools in those groups.

Therefore the following sub-questions were asked:

1. What are the patterns of clinical practice group communication that emerge during student teacher preparation?

2. How do the clinical practice groups use assessment tools during student teacher preparation to evaluate and support learning?
Methods

These research questions and Activity Theory formed the basis for the design of this study. The lens of Activity Theory allowed a focus on the clinical practice group (cooperating teacher, student teacher, university supervisor, district administrator) as the unit of analysis instead of the individual, thus widening the lens through which to interrogate the processes and interactions involved in preparing teacher candidates. This lens also brought into focus the use of tools and artifacts as mediators through which meaning is made within the group (Engeström & Meittinen, 1999).

A multiple-case study seemed appropriate for describing and analyzing a range of similar and contrasting activity settings. Merriam (1998) describes a case as a single unit or system around which there is a boundary. The four cases I examined in this study were each examples of a clinical practice group. The clinical practice groups were bounded in several ways. Each group was made up of a student teacher and those who observe, mentor, or evaluate that student teacher in the field. In all four groups, the student teachers attended the same university teacher preparation program and were evaluated by the same university supervisor. Three of the groups studied were working within a university-district partnership arrangement. The participants within and across the clinical practice groups were chosen based on these criteria as well as their willingness to participate.

The Clinical Practice Groups

The main question this study asks is how the expectations related to the reform movement to professionalize teacher education are enacted in clinical practice activity
settings. The clinical practice settings in this study were chosen based on the state and university expectations imposed on them for standards-based teacher preparation and for their participation in collaborative partnerships.

**Partnership Groups**

Three of the four groups I examined for this study participated in a collaborative partnership between the university that the student teachers attended and the district in which they were placed for clinical practice. The purpose of this partnership as described by the district administrator involved was to provide the student teachers with additional learning resources and feedback on their performance. The district administrator also observed and mentored the three student teachers and met weekly with all of the district’s student teachers from this particular university.

Two of the three groups involved in this university-district partnership were also part of a university-school partnership arrangement. The university-school partnership sought to extend the district partnership to the school level by bridging the university expectations and the school expectations for student teacher learning in the classroom. The cooperating teachers from these two clinical practice groups agreed to work toward a more cohesive environment for the student teachers by learning more about the university expectations. One of the four clinical practice groups I examined in this study was not a part of either partnership arrangement.

**Participants**

The four student teachers were post-baccalaureate students from a small private university in San Diego County and were working towards single-subject credentials in
physical education, math, Spanish, and art. Three of the student teachers were placed in comprehensive public high schools in a large high school district serving East County San Diego. One student teacher was placed in a middle school that was part of a unified school district serving the city of San Diego. All the student teachers spent 20 weeks teaching two of their cooperating teachers’ classes. They also attended a university seminar course during their placements.

The university required that a supervisor work with the student teachers during clinical practice. The supervisor was expected to observe, mentor, and evaluate the student teacher’s performance in the classroom. The four student teachers in this study were supervised by the same person, a retired elementary school principal who also served as adjunct faculty at the university. The cooperating teacher within each clinical practice group had a set of obligations which were similar to the university supervisor. Both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher evaluated the student teacher twice using the same rubric based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The district administrator was responsible for observing each student teacher in groups 1, 2 and 3 at least once during their placement, and meeting regularly with the student teachers as a group in a mentoring capacity. The district administrator did not formally evaluate the student teachers. Table 1 provides an overview of each clinical practice group and summarizes some of the information provided above.
Table 1: Clinical Practice Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Participants</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student teacher 1 coop. teacher 1 univ. supervisor district admin.</td>
<td>student teacher 2 coop. teacher 2 univ. supervisor district admin.</td>
<td>student teacher 3 coop. teacher 3 univ. supervisor district admin.</td>
<td>student teacher 4 coop. teacher 4 univ. supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Arrangement</td>
<td>university-district university-school</td>
<td>university-district university-school</td>
<td>university-district</td>
<td>no partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>World Language (Spanish)</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>middle school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positionality**

As the school site coordinator of the partnership between the university and my school, I had easy access to these research settings and participants. My access to these settings was facilitated by my position as the site coordinator of the collaborative effort between the university and the school site where I serve as a classroom teacher and cooperating teacher. During the time of this study, I had been teaching high school English for 11 years. I had also been working with student teachers in my classroom for three years. I served as a cooperating teacher for a student teacher from the university during the time of this study; however, my student teacher and I were not part of the four clinical practice groups examined here.

In the fall of 2007, the university’s coordinator of student teacher placement and I initiated a set of meetings among the key players involved with the student teachers: placement coordinator, university supervisor, district administrator, and other cooperating teachers at my site. My role was to facilitate collaborative meetings among the cooperating teachers as well as between the teachers and the university placement
coordinator, university supervisor, and district administrator. These meetings were
designed to 1) exchange information about university and school procedures, 2) improve
our understanding of the ways the student teachers were learning in both the university
and classroom environments, and 3) encourage the student teachers to apply their
university-based lessons to their classrooms.

My position as the lead teacher for this collaborative effort allowed me access to
the participants and settings. However, it had the potential to affect the ways in which
the participants reported their information and answered interview questions. The
participants might have been sensitive to the fact that I am in regular contact with the
participants of their clinical practice group and might have believed that their responses
could have been communicated to the other participants. On the other hand, I have not
worked with the student teachers or cooperating teachers who participated in this study
from the other high school sites that have not been part of the collaborative effort.
Because I had no professional responsibilities in relationship to these non-partnership
groups, these data are unlikely to have been impacted by my position.

Data Collection and Analysis

The basic tenets of Activity Theory and the research questions posed in this study
prompted the design of the data collection and analysis methods. The following sections
detail the data sources, the collection strategies, and analysis methods used to answer the
research questions.
Daily Communication Questionnaires

This data collection tool was designed to gather information about the patterns of interaction among participants in each clinical practice group. A daily on-line survey asked participants to recall and record their interactions with other participants of the group along with the use of any resources or tools during these communications (see Appendix B). The participants from each group filled out the questionnaire each day for three weeks. Data from these questionnaires were compiled and organized by clinical practice group.

Student Teaching Documents

I collected and analyzed documents from the university program file for each of the four student teachers. An examination of the dates on the written assessments allowed me to determine how frequently each assessment tool was administered. Additionally, I analyzed the written comments on the assessment tools for content and compared these comments to comments made during the participant interviews. Finally, I used these documents to elicit responses during the participant interviews.

Video and Document Elicitation Interviews

I conducted interviews with individual participants during the last week of the student teachers’ placements. At this point, all student teacher assessments had been completed, and university supervisor and cooperating teacher evaluations had been submitted to the university by the supervisor. I used these assessments, such as weekly progress reports and supervisor observation forms, as well as a 15-minute video recording of the student teacher, to elicit a discussion of the processes and outcomes of
preparing the student teachers. I video recorded these interviews so I could keep track of the places that the video elicited participant responses. Next I transcribed the recordings and analyzed them to determine patterns in communication and to find the ways in which the participants talked about using the assessment tools (both those tools provided for them and created by them).

**Summary**

The main question in this study was designed to understand how clinical practice groups’ daily work is related to the state and university expectations for standards-based teacher preparation and partnerships. In order to answer this question, I employed three main data collection strategies. These data were analyzed to describe the patterns of communication and use of assessment tools both within and across all four clinical practice groups. The findings, when examined through the lens of Activity Theory, help to understand the ways reform was enacted in these groups.
Chapter 5-Findings

Overview

Professionalization has become a common theme in education policy discussions even in the context of the controversy surrounding this political ideology. The movement to professionalize teacher education has changed the credentialing guidelines in most states and has affected the ways in which many university teacher education programs prepare new teachers. This movement is primarily defined by standards-based preparation, mandated performance assessments, and university-school partnerships.

In particular, professionalization has affected the outcomes and expectations of clinical practice in teacher education in California. This study was conducted during the first year of a new law in California. California Senate Bill 2042 mandated universities to administer a state approved standards-based teacher performance assessment to all teacher candidates. As the state increased its demands for accountability from university programs, the programs have in turn expected more from student teachers, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. These expectations followed the basic tenets of professionalization and included the use of professional standards to guide and assess student teacher learning. They also included the creation and maintenance of partnerships between the university preparation program and the districts and schools these programs served.

This study was designed to add to the knowledge base regarding clinical practice in teacher education in the context of California’s effort to professionalize teacher
education. In particular, I wanted to gain a better understanding of the ways in which these state and university expectations were enacted in the daily practices of those who work with student teachers in the field.

Using Activity Theory as a conceptual framework, the following overarching question guided this study’s design and implementation, and my analysis of the data.

How are state and university expectations for clinical practice in teacher education, including standards-based preparation and university-school partnerships, enacted through patterns of communication and the use of assessment tools in a clinical practice group?

A clinical practice group was defined in this study as a student teacher and those individuals who observe, mentor, or evaluate the student teacher in the field during clinical practice. In the subsequent discussion I sometimes refer to the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and district administrator as mentors.

The state and university expectations for the four clinical practice groups in this study primarily include (1) the use of the California State Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) to guide student teacher learning and evaluation and (2) the formation and the maintenance of partnership arrangements between the university program and district, and between the university and a school site.

The California State Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs) were developed to guide mentoring and evaluation strategies within the clinical practice groups. Specifically, the state required that all student teachers pass the California Teacher Performance Assessment (CalTPA), an instrument designed to assess teaching performance based on the CSTPs. The four student teachers participating in my study
had to pass the CalTPA. Additionally, the university in this study created standards-based formative and summative assessments of student teacher learning. These tools were introduced into the clinical practice groups with the expectation that the student teachers and their mentors use them to guide and assess student teacher learning.

Another expectation for clinical practice groups in this study was the formation of a partnership between the university preparation program and the district or schools in which the student teachers were placed. The university preparation program launched two levels of partnership arrangements: the university-district partnership and the university-school site partnership.

The first level was the university-district partnership. Three of the four student teachers were placed in the partnership district. According to the partnership agreement, a district administrator would provide the student teachers with the district’s perspective on their teaching performance. In addition, this administrator would evaluate whether or not to hire the student teacher after completion of clinical practice.

The second level of partnership was the university-school site partnership. In this study two of the three clinical practice groups involved in the university-district partnership were also involved in this more focused partnership between the university and a school site. This partnership was designed to bridge the gap between university expectations and the cooperating teachers’ expectations of student teacher learning and performance in order to create a more coherent learning experience for the student teachers.
The university expectations for these partnerships differed from the state
expectations. The state has adopted the clinical practice standards of the National
Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), which state that “Both [the
university program] and school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing, and
evaluating the unit’s conceptual framework(s) and the school program” (NCATE, 2008).
In this study, the university did not expect the district administrator or the cooperating
teachers to help create or evaluate the program’s framework, nor were they expected to
work with the university on the district or school programs.

A summary of the university and state expectations in relation to the groups
examined in this study is represented in Figure 4.

Figure 4: University and State Expectations for Clinical Practice
In order to understand the ways in which the university and state expectations for clinical practice were enacted through the patterns of communication and use of assessment tools in the clinical practice groups, the following sub-questions were asked:

1. What are the patterns of clinical practice group communication that emerge during student teacher preparation?

2. How do the clinical practice groups use assessment tools during student teacher preparation to evaluate and support learning?

The main question of this study was informed by the two sub-questions. Therefore I present the findings from the two sub-questions listed above first before turning to a comprehensive discussion of the main question.

**Findings Related to Question #1**

What are the patterns of clinical practice group communication that emerge during student teacher preparation?

The first question was designed to describe the patterns of communication in the four clinical practice groups. My primary data source was a questionnaire (see Appendix B). Participants of each group were asked to complete a questionnaire every day for a three-week period during the student teachers’ placement. This questionnaire was designed to gather information about daily interactions within each group and was administered during the last three weeks of the university’s academic semester. As a result, the week three questionnaire data included information from the final week the university supervisor worked with the student teachers. The university supervisor and cooperating teachers administered their final evaluations of the student teachers’
performance during that week, even though the student teachers would remain in the classroom for another five to six weeks until the end of the school’s semester. I used two other data sources to answer this research question: documents from the student teachers’ university files and transcripts from final interviews conducted with each participant during the final weeks of the 20-week semester placement. The questionnaires and documents contain information reported on a daily and weekly basis about interactions and communications, while the interview data represent the participants’ recall about these interactions and communications from the 20-week semester.

The following sections first detail the frequency, length, and directionality of communication patterns within and across all four clinical practice groups. Then, I describe the quality and specific content of the communication patterns. The findings are discussed briefly throughout the section and are followed by overall comprehensive discussion of the patterns of communication in the clinical practice groups.

**Patterns Related to Frequency, Length, and Directionality of Communication**

Overall, the cooperating teacher and university supervisor communicated with the student teachers on a regular basis. The frequency of these interactions remained constant throughout the semester, however the length of each communication decreased over time. Triadic interactions among the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher occurred only twice during the student teacher’s placement. Additionally, the mentors did not regularly communicate with each other throughout the semester. The following sections describe these findings in detail.
Communication Patterns Between the Cooperating and Student Teacher

Cooperating and student teachers in each clinical practice group reported their daily communication as well as the approximate length of communication on the three-week daily questionnaire. The length of each communication did not include the time the teachers spent observing each other teach. This reported time therefore represented minutes spent engaged in direct communication, including communication unrelated to teaching practices. Daily questionnaire data for the final three weeks of each student teacher’s placement showed that face-to-face communication occurred between the cooperating and student teachers on a daily basis.

When asked during the interview if the frequency of communication reported in the questionnaire was representative of the entire 20-week semester, both cooperating and student teachers across all four groups confirmed that it was common to communicate in person on a daily basis. They also reported that additional communication via email and text message occurred sporadically, approximately one to three electronic communications per week. Analysis of the interview data verified that the electronic communication pattern as reported on the questionnaire was representative of the entire placement.

The frequency of communication between the cooperating and student teachers examined in this study demonstrated the cooperating teachers’ regular involvement in the process of preparing student teachers in their classrooms. They did not simply step aside to leave the student teacher alone in uncharted territory, but were available daily to provide support. One possible explanation for this pattern across groups may be that the cooperating teachers saw themselves as ultimately responsible for student learning in the
classes in which the student teachers were practicing. The interview data from the cooperating teachers supports this explanation. When asked about their primary role in their clinical practice group, three out of the four cooperating teachers described themselves as the person responsible for student learning in the classroom. Additionally, all of the cooperating teachers saw themselves as the primary and most influential mentor to the student teacher in their classroom. These perceived responsibilities may account for the frequency of interaction between the cooperating and student teachers.

Although the cooperating and student teachers interacted on a daily basis, the length of these daily interactions decreased over the course of the placement. This pattern emerged in the questionnaire data and was confirmed by the participants in the interview data.

Figure 5 shows the change in the duration of each communication between cooperating and student teachers from week one to week three as reported in the questionnaire. In order to calculate an approximate number of communication minutes per day between the cooperating and student teacher, I calculated the mean number of daily minutes the participants reported each week. Then I found the mean number of minutes reported between the student and cooperating teacher in each group to estimate the overall average length of daily communication.
The cooperating and student teachers in clinical practice groups one through three reported a decrease in communication time during these three weeks, while clinical practice group four showed a slight increase. This exception may be due to the fact the student teacher in group four received all new students on week 10 of her placement. The other groups worked with the same students throughout the 20-week placement. The change in student population may have prompted lengthier communication between the cooperating and student teacher within group four.

Analysis of the interview data also confirmed an overall decrease in the length of these daily interactions over the 20-week semester placement. For example, the cooperating teacher from group one said “We talk about half as much as we did in the beginning.” The student teacher from this same group said, “Toward the end communication was less but more than observations.” Similarly the cooperating teacher from group three said “toward the end I would stay in the office more during her lessons.

Figure 5: Cooperating and Student Teacher Communication Time
and we had less to talk about.” The student teacher’s comments from this group corresponded with her cooperating teacher. She said, “At some point in the semester [the cooperating teacher] was definitely out of the classroom for my two periods and so we would talk less.”

The cooperating and student teachers from clinical practice group four did not report or comment on any change in the amount of time spent communicating over the length of the semester. This result duplicates the increase in communication minutes found in the questionnaire data, a result which may be explained by the fact the student teacher in group four was assigned new students in the middle of her placement.

The tendency for the cooperating and student teachers to communicate for a shorter length of time over the semester resembles the gradual release model of teaching and learning (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). This model assumes that a learner should gradually begin to problem-solve on her own only after observing a model teacher and practicing under supervision. It is not clear from the data whether the cooperating teachers had a guided-practice framework in mind. In any case, over time the student teachers presumably had mastered some of the procedural tasks such as taking attendance and using the grading program, and they would then be expected to carry out these tasks without support. The university program did not explicitly suggest this gradual release model, yet this pattern existed in three of the four groups. One explanation for the decrease in the amount of time spent communicating with the student teacher may be the cooperating teacher’s belief that the student teacher was performing appropriately and no longer needed as much guided practice.
I did not find significant differences in the patterns of the cooperating teachers working within the partnership arrangements and those teachers from other groups. This finding may be due in part to the fact that the university’s expectations for the partnership groups did not include a particular recommendation for the frequency or length of cooperating and student teacher interaction.

Communication Between Student Teachers and the University Supervisor

As with the cooperating teachers, the university supervisor tended to be a frequent presence and support for the student teacher. Regular weekly contact existed between the university supervisor and student teachers across all four groups. Documentation of the university supervisor’s visits from the student teachers’ files indicates that she observed each student teacher approximately 10 times during the university’s 12-week semester. Student teachers reported in the questionnaires and interviews that the university supervisor sent email notifications of her observation days and times, but that no other information was included in those emails. Both the university supervisor and student teachers reported no communication other than these emails and the observation visits.

Table 2 shows the weeks during which these visits occurred for each student teacher. The university semester lasted from week 3 to week 14.

Table 2: University Supervisor Classroom Visits by Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to these data, the university supervisor tended to visit the student teachers on a weekly basis during the university academic semester. Very few visits took place during the last five weeks of the student teachers’ placement.

Initially the university supervisor observed an entire instructional period and talked with the student teacher afterwards for about 10 to 15 minutes. Student teachers in clinical practice groups one, two, and three also reported that towards the end of the placement the university supervisor would often observe and leave before the end of the class period. For example the student teacher in group one said, "she would watch the first 20 minutes and fill out a report. During the last few minutes of class she would come and talk to me about it when the kids were playing whatever sport.” The student teacher in group two stated, “Later on [in the semester], sometimes she would leave before the end of the lesson and leave her report for me.” Similarly, the student teacher in group three reported:

…at the end a lot of times she would just leave before I was done with my lesson, so I never really got a chance to talk with her after. She would leave the form for me, but physically talking to her, toward the end we didn't get to do it that much--like the last three maybe four observations.

The university supervisor confirmed the tendency to debrief less towards the end of the placement:

In the beginning I do more of that [observation and feedback] and I kind of slack off as I see the student is progressing like they should. I would say in the beginning at least the first three weeks I'm going to be heavy on, I am going to be there a lot I am going to be there a long time.

Again clinical practice group four demonstrated an exception to this pattern. The university supervisor noted that she spent the same amount of time with the student
teacher throughout the semester. She explained, “[the student teacher] was having classroom management issues so we were discussing that quite a bit up to the end.” Documents from the student teacher’s university file indicate that the supervisor did spend more time with this student teacher during the last five weeks of the placement than she did with the other student teachers. My interview with the university supervisor indicated that she was less comfortable with this particular student teacher’s ability to manage behavior in the classroom. The supervisor’s comments on her last few observation reports also support her belief that the student teacher was struggling with classroom management. The supervisor described this student teacher’s classes as “a strange situation, she was in an art class, and…the teacher would have to step in because the kids were so rowdy. We were trying to see what she could have done to control it. To her credit she had…bad classes behavior-wise.” This student teacher’s apparent classroom management issues coupled with the fact that she was assigned a group of new students during week 10 of the semester seem to account for the exceptional patterns of communication found in this group.

The university program explicitly required that the supervisor visit the student teachers on a weekly basis. The supervisor commented in the interview, "I had to get 10 to 12 visits in, so I was heavy on the front and I ended up getting about that.” One reason for fewer university supervisor visits during the last weeks of the placement may be that the university program’s academic semester ended on week 14 of the 20-week placement. The university supervisor had the option to continue her visits and schedule a final evaluation after the university’s academic semester ended. However, the pattern shown in Table 2 shows that she did not visit much during those weeks. The supervisor said
“The direct communication, the consults, kind of fall off as time goes by because they know what I expect and I am getting what I expect.” The supervisor’s reference to her expectations here may help to account for the overall decrease in communication time with the student teachers. The gradual release model referenced earlier is a plausible way to account for the overall decrease in communication time found between the supervisor and cooperating teacher.

Overall, the mentors in this study tended gradually to spend less time interacting with the student teachers over the length of the semester. This finding seems to indicate that most of the student teachers were progressing in a way that fit the mentors’ expectations.

Patterns of communication between the student teachers and the university supervisor were similar across all four clinical practice groups regardless of the groups’ involvement in one of the two partnership arrangements. However, the supervisor visited the student teacher from clinical practice group four more often and for longer periods of time towards the end of the semester placement. As stated, this difference was due to this student teacher’s continued struggle to maintain an effective classroom environment towards the end of the semester, and might be a result of a new population of students in week ten. The partnership arrangement does not seem to explain this exceptional pattern.

Communication between the Student Teachers and District Administrator

During the interview, the district administrator (who was only working with clinical practice groups one, two, and three as part of a university-district partnership) reported observing all of the three student teachers twice during the semester. None of these visits occurred during the period of time that the participants filled out the daily
questionnaires and therefore the interview data serve as the only evidence of this pattern. The district administrator reported that she would typically leave immediately after the observation and call the student teacher that evening to debrief. These phone conversations, described by both the student teachers and district administrator, lasted about 15 to 20 minutes.

In addition to the observations and phone conversations, the district administrator met with the student teachers as a group once a week after their seminar class. Student teachers reported sharing successes and problems they experienced in the classroom, and guest speakers were brought in to discuss topics including classroom management, students with special needs, English language learners, resume writing and interviewing techniques. The student teachers and district administrator describe these meetings as an extension of their seminar class. Therefore, the nature of the communication that took place during these meetings was not considered part of the clinical practice group communication for the purposes of this study.

The district administrator’s participation with the preparation of student teachers in clinical practice groups one, two, and three was due to a partnership agreement between the district and the university. However, the district administrator did not spend a substantial amount of time communicating within these groups. For example, the cooperating teachers reported no communication with the district administrator during her two visits to the classroom, and the university supervisor reported no communication with the district administrator during the twenty-week placement. As a result, the district administrator’s relative influence on the patterns of communication of the clinical practice groups was minimal. The small impact on the communication within the groups
also substantiates the possibility that the communication differences in group four were
not connected to the partnership, but were a result of the circumstances of her placement.

Communication Between University Supervisor and Cooperating Teachers

As with the district administrator, the university supervisor and cooperating
teacher both reported little to no communication with the other mentors in each group.
The supervisor reported:

I try to at least communicate with the [cooperating] teacher for five to ten
minutes during the visit...that is hard to do because of the teachers’
schedules, finding time to just talk with them for a few minutes.
Sometimes it just happens because they have time to do it. But typically
we don’t have time.

The cooperating teachers also described the interactions with the supervisor as irregular
and brief with very general references to the student teacher’s progress. The cooperating
teacher from clinical practice group one stated, “There wasn’t much time talking with
[the university supervisor] when she came to observe. We spoke about five minutes
every other week.” The cooperating teacher from group three reported:

At the beginning we spoke more like 'how's it going' toward the end she
was assured that [the student teacher] was doing just fine so she would
move on. She would come in, see what was going on and scoot out of
here a couple of minutes early and leave the observation form without
talking to me or to [the student teacher].

This cooperating teacher seemed to feel that the reason for the supervisor’s decrease in
communication was due to the student teacher’s progress in meeting performance
expectations.

A small but notable exception to this pattern between the cooperating teachers and
university supervisor occurred in clinical practice groups one and two. These groups
were involved in the university-school partnership. The cooperating teachers in this group reported additional communication with the university supervisor during a one-hour meeting at the school site. The cooperating teachers working within this partnership arrangement initiated this meeting. No other meetings are reported to have taken place over the course of the 20-week semester. The content and quality of this additional interaction are described in the next section.

**Triadic Communication Among the Supervisor, Cooperating and Student Teachers**

The university supervisor, cooperating and student teachers in each clinical practice group reported communicating as a triad only twice during the placement. The first of these meetings took place during week 9 and the second during week 13. The reported purpose of this triadic conversation was to discuss the student teacher’s performance on the mid-term and final evaluation. These meetings typically lasted about 15 to 20 minutes and did not include the district administrator. This particular pattern of communication was the only time these three participants of the clinical practice group reported meeting as a triad for a sustained conversation about student teacher progress.

Overall, mentors tended to communicate with the student teacher but not with each other. This communication pattern may be related to the belief expressed during the interviews that each mentor had her own distinct role in the mentoring process and that the purpose of multiple mentors during clinical practice was to provide the student teacher with different perspectives on his/her teaching performance. For example most of the participants across all four groups defined the role of the university supervisor as the person responsible for connecting the student teachers’ performance to the California
Standards for the Teaching Profession. The cooperating teachers saw themselves primarily as mentors who focused on content curriculum and student learning. The district administrator’s role as described by the supervisor and the administrator herself was to help the student teachers understand how their performance would be viewed by a future employer. The participants’ definition of their role did not include sharing information about the student teacher’s progress or their mentoring strategies. Each member contributed to the activity of preparing the student teacher in different ways, and participants did not necessarily feel compelled to communicate or collaborate about it.

This implicit understanding, that each mentor works directly with the student teacher but not with each other, is evident in the interviews. The district administrator said of her role:

As you introduce someone at the district level who is on the surface doing the same work as the university supervisor, it is important to make sure that there is a distinction, that one doesn't trump the other, that this is really in-cooperation with rather than instead-of and same with the cooperating teacher, that this is in-addition and not instead-of...than the student teacher’s job is to take in everything they see and hear and add it to their own personal tool box where appropriate.

Similarly the university supervisor stated:

When [the district administrator] gives observations she is giving them another point of view that is different from the supervisors or cooperating teachers she is giving the district point of view how the district would look at that student teacher should they come in for an interview. She helps the students understand that they are really in a 16-week job interview so they need to be respectful of the people at the schools the faculty, principal, and also need to be on target as much as possible with lesson plans prepared.

The way in which the mentors’ roles were defined by the participants within and across groups may help to account for the infrequent communication among mentors in each
group. The group participants seemed to feel that the division of labor in preparing student teachers did not require communication among themselves.

Summary

The frequency, length, and direction of communication found in the three groups involved in the university-district partnership were very similar. Figure 6 shows the frequency (indicated by the thickness of the arrows) and direction of communication in these groups.
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Figure 6: Communication in University-District Partnership Groups

The student teacher was at the center of the communication among participants in groups one through three. The cooperating and student teachers communicated the most frequently. The student teacher communicated the least with the district administrator. These patterns make sense in light of the proximity between the cooperating teacher and
student teacher who shared a classroom and the individual expectations for the amount of interaction between the mentors and the student teacher. Figure 6 also shows that the mentors communicated very little with each other. Due to the university-school site partnership, the cooperating teachers in groups one and two had one additional meeting with the university supervisor that group three did not. However, one might expect that if the partnership did have an effect on communication patterns that more than one meeting would have taken place. There was not a well-evidenced difference between partnership and non-partnerships groups.

Clinical practice group four was not involved in the partnership arrangements, but did share the other groups’ patterns of communication as shown in Figure 7. There was one discernable difference, however between group four and the other groups, and that was the absence of the district administrator’s communication with the student teacher in group four.

Figure 7: Communication Patterns in the Non-Partnership Group
Overall, the four clinical practice groups examined in this study showed similar patterns in the frequency, length, and directionality of communication across members of the clinical practice groups regardless of district or school partnership agreements with few exceptions. The small differences that did exist in clinical practice group four are related to classroom management problems.

**Patterns Related to the Content and Quality of Communication**

In addition to patterns related to the frequency and duration of communication, I also examined the content and quality of communication across the four groups. The communication of the mentors and the student teachers across the clinical practice groups tended to focus on classroom management and control. Additionally, the mentors tended to use questions as a way to elicit talk from the student teachers about their perception of their own performance. The following sections detail these findings related to the content and quality of communication within the clinical practice groups.

**Content of Communication**

The questionnaire data showed that the topic most often discussed over the length of the 15-day data collection window was classroom management. The questionnaire prompted participants each day to place check marks next to topics discussed with other participants of the group. The choices included 16 topics that were ultimately grouped into four categories. These categories included: classroom management; content and curriculum; scheduling and procedures, and university program procedures and coursework. Table 3 shows the percentage of days (15 days total) the student teachers reported communicating about each of the topics. Similarly, Table 4 shows the
percentage of days the cooperating teachers reported communicating about each of the topics.

Table 3: Student Teacher Report of Topics Discussed with Cooperating Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Teacher 1</th>
<th>Student Teacher 2</th>
<th>Student Teacher 3</th>
<th>Student Teacher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content and Curriculum</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Schedule and Procedures</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Coursework and Procedures</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Cooperating Teacher Report of Topics Discussed with Student Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher 1</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher 2</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher 3</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content and Curriculum</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Schedule and Procedures</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Coursework &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cooperating and student teachers both reported discussing classroom management issues most often. These data also show that cooperating and student teachers did not always report the same topics as being discussed each day. The discrepancy in reporting between these participants might be a result of the student teachers’ distraction during a busy day of teaching or the cooperating teacher’s belief that a topic was emphasized when it may have just been mentioned briefly. The data do not account for this difference. This finding does, however, make clear that reported interactions may not always be indicative of actual interactions. On the other hand, the topics reported by the participants have the advantage of revealing how the participants may have understood the interactions.
In clinical practice group one, the cooperating teacher explained during the interview that, “The main focus with [the student teacher] was always confidence, all teachers need to have confidence in front of the students to maintain order.” The student teacher in group one noted, "Classroom management, control in the classroom...for the first couple of weeks both [the university supervisor] and [the cooperating teacher] focused on that with me.” The cooperating teacher from group two mentioned that she focused on her student teacher’s confidence during debriefings. The student teacher confirms this focus by stating:

Classroom management was huge--- everyday over the entire semester. I had a crazy class. It would have been different if I had a better class. We would talk about individual students in terms of classroom management more than anything else...sometimes test scores like 'whoa what happened to that kid' or struggling students. But for the most part it was classroom management.

The student teacher from group three said, “Honestly [the cooperating teacher] didn't give me feedback on my written lesson plans. She pretty much let me do what I wanted. We talked about control strategies most of the time.” Similarly, the cooperating teacher in group four noted that she and her student teacher often discussed “…bringing her out to raise her voice, getting her professional teacher voice, without yelling, she had to work on that because she is more reserved and more quiet just as a person naturally.” Not only did the cooperating teachers focus on classroom management, but the university supervisor and district administrator did as well.

The student teacher in group four said that her communication with the university supervisor was “more about my teaching, being authoritative and getting that teacher voice and not asking, but making them work.” The university supervisor stated during
the interview “the most important thing that I hone in on is managing the classroom because if you can't manage the classroom you can't teach.” Similarly, the district administrator noted:

If I can get them to that point where they really command the room and the kids are engaged and connected with them that to me is huge. The content they can always grasp, but that demeanor, that engagement that will be significant in controlling the room.

The tendency for clinical practice groups to focus on classroom control and student behavior may be a result of the participants’ beliefs about what a student teacher should know and be able to do by the end of his/her clinical practice placement. I coded the interview data for characteristics of the ideal student teacher described by each participant. Figure 8 shows each participant’s understanding of the ideal student teacher at the end of his/her placement.

Figure 8: Participant Beliefs: Characteristics of the Ideal Student Teacher
This figure reveals that a student teacher’s control over his/her classroom was believed to be an important quality of a student teacher in all four clinical practice groups. This belief was consistent among all participants regardless of their role within the group.

Considerable attention to issues of classroom management is consistent with the data that showed a decrease in the length of communication over time. It might be concluded that the student teachers in groups one through three demonstrated an appropriate amount of classroom control towards the end of their placement, while the student teacher in clinical practice group four did not. This conclusion may ultimately account for the decrease in communication found in groups one through three but not in four.

**Quality of Communication**

Not only was there a pattern in what the clinical practice groups talked about, but there was also a pattern in the ways these topics were discussed. When asked to describe a typical debriefing conversation, both the student and cooperating teachers reported the use of questioning to elicit the student teachers’ understanding of his/her performance. During the interview, student and cooperating teachers were asked to describe mentoring practices. Most participants within and across groups reported the mentors’ use of questions like “How do you think the lesson went?” and “What might you do differently next time?”

The mentors across groups provided a consistent rationale for asking these questions during debriefing. The reasons were twofold. One reason was to avoid directly
stating negative feedback for fear that the student teacher would feel defensive or defeated. For example, the cooperating teacher from group two said of her student teacher, “She didn't take criticism well. She was very sensitive, so I tried to adjust how I spoke with her. To help her take the criticizing better I started asking questions instead of pointing things out.” Similarly, the cooperating teacher from group three recalled, “I asked a lot of questions. People don't like to be told what to do...most of the time I would say ‘how did it go’ and she would say, ‘I am already making these changes for next period.’ Sometimes when there is too much nit picking going on we can't relax as a teacher.” One reason the cooperating teachers seemed to rely on questioning seemed to be to ensure that their relationship with the student teachers remained positive.

Second, the cooperating teachers felt that it was important to understand what the student teacher noticed about his or her own practice and whether it matched their own understanding. If the student teacher failed to notice something that the cooperating teacher felt was important, the cooperating teacher would then bring it to the student teacher’s attention. For example the cooperating teacher from group one described a typical debriefing conversation by stating, “I would ask ‘how do you think it went?’ [the student teacher] was honest about what went well, what didn't go well…If he didn't bring up a mistake, I would bring it up.” Also, during her interview, the cooperating teacher from group four said the following while watching a video of her student teacher:

I wouldn’t say much here because she is doing it exactly how I would have done it, with handing out the worksheets with the pictures still there, um then I would have collected up the [pictures] and gotten them out of the way after a few more minutes because they will distract them. Other than that looks like she is doing it how I would do it.
Overall the cooperating teachers were concerned that the student teachers made instructional decisions that were congruous with what they might do and that the student teachers reflected on similar aspects of practice. The cooperating teachers seemed to use questions to attempt to uncover their student teachers’ understandings about the instruction in order to better align the student teacher’s practice with their own.

The rationale for using questions as a mentoring strategy also appeared in the interview data from the district administrator and university supervisor. The district administrator explained:

My first question is always, tell me about your perception of the lesson. What went really well, what was effective and at the same time what was not as effective as you wanted it to be, what would you do different next time? If I pick up on something that they haven’t gotten, I want to bring that to her attention so she has full consciousness.

The university supervisor reported using a similar strategy to debrief:

I will say, how did you think it went today and they will say...you know, and then I will say 'this is what I saw' something that really needs to be addressed and then they will say, well yeah, I saw that too. I only ever had one student who didn't agree with me.

The university supervisor and district administrator expressed similar reasons for using questions as a way to debrief with student teachers.

The use of questions during debriefing tended to focus on the maintenance of a positive relationship with the student teacher or with the need to develop a shared understanding of the student teacher’s performance. The mentors did not include the importance of developing the student teachers’ ability to reflect on their own practice as a rationale for questioning. The ability to reflect on practice is an outcome described in the
state standards. However, this expectation did not seem to serve as the rationale for using questions during mentoring practice. This is not to say that the student teachers were not developing reflective skills during their placement, but that the mentors did not report it as the underlying rationale for using this particular mentoring strategy.

One possible reason for the cooperating teachers’ apparent drive to maintain a positive relationship is the expectation that they serve as both a mentor and evaluator to the student teacher. These conflicting responsibilities may not be easy for the cooperating teachers to negotiate on a daily basis with their student teachers. The use of questions during debriefing may, therefore, have developed as a way to negotiate this dual role.

The content of daily and weekly interaction between the mentors and student teachers differed from the content of the triadic communication that took place during the mid-term and final evaluation meetings. The triadic conversations were driven by the similarities or differences in the university supervisor’s score and the cooperating teacher’s score on each rubric item. The university supervisor said during the interview:

I like to flip through both at the same time and it is very rare that we are off, maybe just one here or there and so the student teacher gets the clear picture that the cooperating teacher and I are on the same page.

The cooperating teacher from group one said, “During the meeting, if I come in with a score of three out of five and university supervisor comes in with a score of four out of five, you want to be fair and talk about that.” The student teacher from group four said:

We would look at these side by side because [the cooperating teacher and university supervisor] are both looking at the same thing, and when they were different…I think that is more interesting. When we all sat down, we would talk about why did [the cooperating teacher] pick a different one than [the university supervisor].
The triadic communication tended to focus on the ways in which the supervisor and cooperating teacher scored the student teacher on the mid-term and final evaluation rubrics rather than a conversation about the student teachers’ strengths and weaknesses as a practitioner.

The content discussed during triadic interactions differs from the content of the daily and weekly mentoring interactions. The purpose of the triadic interaction seemed to be to reach a shared understanding between the cooperating teacher and university supervisor of the student teacher’s performance rather than a detailed discussion of the student teacher’s progress and next steps. The student teacher from group one stated:

You only have to worry if you have a lot of ones and twos, if you are getting threes and fours then you are okay. After the mid-term the forms sat on my desk all year and I didn't look at them. After the final meeting I went back and compared them. Hopefully by that point you feel confident that you are prepared to teach. I looked through it and got more fours so I was like “cool”. I think it was because I got more confident.

Overall the student teachers’ talk during the interviews about the mid term and final evaluations did not center around specific aspects of their teaching but rather on a general understanding of their preparedness to enter the profession. This pattern may be a result of the content of the conversation during these meetings.

**Summary**

The topic most often discussed during mentor and student teacher communication was classroom management. There were six standards against which student teachers in the clinical practice groups were required by the state and university to be assessed. Only one of these standards called for the student teacher to demonstrate the ability to effectively manage classroom procedures and student behavior, yet this one standard
seemed to be the focus of most of the communication between the mentors and the student teachers. Also, most participants reported that the mentors regularly used questions during debriefing to elicit the student teachers’ understandings of their own practice. The rationale given for using this strategy was to see if the student teacher was noticing the same things about their performance as the cooperating teacher, and to avoid giving the student teachers negative feedback. Finally, the content of communication during the triadic meetings among the supervisor, cooperating and student teachers focused on comparing the mentors’ evaluations of the student teachers’ performance. Analyses of the student teachers’ reports indicate that these triadic communications did not help them to understand their performance across the six standards measured on the rubric.

**Findings Related to Question #2:**

How does the clinical practice group use mediating tools/artifacts during student teacher preparation to support learning?

The second research question sought to uncover the ways in which the clinical practice groups used assessment tools to prepare student teachers in the field. According to Activity Theory, actors use tools to mediate actions and cognition while working toward the object (or goal) of the activity. The document, questionnaire, and interview data collected for this study provided a description of the ways in which the clinical practice groups used the formative and summative assessment tools created by the university and state. Analysis of the use of these tools allowed for a closer look at how university and state expectations for clinical practice were enacted in the daily work of preparing student teachers.
There were four assessment tools designed by university personnel and used by the participants of each clinical practice group. The first of these four, the Weekly Progress and Reflection Reports, was intended to be completed by the cooperating teachers and used as a formative assessment of student teacher performance. This tool was the only one that was not organized according the categories of California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The Student Teaching Formative Assessment Summary was also designed to guide the supervisor during her observations of student teachers. Finally, the Mid-Term and Final Evaluations for Clinical Practice, identical assessment tools, were intended for use by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor to evaluate student teacher performance.

In this section, I have organized the findings related to this question by the assessment tools that were used across the four clinical practice groups. The district administrator, who worked with clinical practice groups one, two, and three, did not formally assess the student teachers but rather observed and debriefed with them verbally. She reported that she neither used nor reviewed any of the assessment tools used by the other group participants.

**Weekly Progress and Reflection Reports**

The Weekly Progress and Reflection Reports (see Appendix C) were not consistently used as a formative assessment tool throughout the semester. When they were used, cooperating teachers tended to focus on classroom management in their comments about student teacher performance.

According to the interview data, the Weekly Progress and Reflection Reports were given to the cooperating teachers by the university supervisor during the third week
of the student teachers’ placement. The form is divided into two parts. The first is a rubric for the cooperating teachers to rate the student teacher on punctuality, preparation, knowledge, and communication. The cooperating teachers rated the student teacher as U (unacceptable), I (inconsistent), A (acceptable), and C (consistent) on each item. The report also provided a place for the cooperating teacher to write comments. The purpose of the report, as written on the form, was “to provide a weekly summary of the teacher candidate’s demonstration of professional attributes essential to success in a placement and the teaching profession.” It is not clear from these instructions or the expectations written in the handbook who the audience of these summaries may be, or how they intend to use these summaries.

According to the university Student Teacher Handbook, the cooperating teacher filled out a report each week and gave it to the student teacher. The student teachers in turn gave this form to their seminar instructor during their weekly class and received credit for doing so. This tool was apparently designed to transfer information from the clinical practice group setting to the university course setting. Although the purpose for this crossover was not made explicit, the participants of each clinical practice group believed the form provided the university documentation that the student teacher received feedback on a regular basis from the cooperating teacher.

Because the student teachers were told that they would receive credit in their seminar class, it is implied that the seminar instructor would read these reports. It is unclear why this formative assessment was not organized by the state standards for the teaching profession, standards which inform the university’s formative assessments and
the summative evaluation which are used by both the supervisor and cooperating teachers.

Documents in the student teachers’ university files showed that these forms were initially completed by most of the cooperating teachers, but by the end of the semester they had stopped using them. Table 5 shows the number of Weekly Progress and Reflection Reports filled out by each cooperating teacher over the 20-week semester.

Table 5: Frequency of Cooperating Teacher Completion of Weekly Progress Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cooperating teachers did not receive the forms from the university supervisor until week three, and the university semester ended on week 14 of the 20-week semester. The student teachers were evaluated during week ten of their placement, the week when the cooperating teachers stopped consistently filling out the forms.

The written comments on the Weekly Progress and Reflection Reports revealed that the cooperating teachers’ comments on these forms tended to center primarily around issues of classroom management. Figure 9 shows the percentage of the total number of reports the cooperating teacher filled out that included comments for each of the following categories: classroom management, student engagement, instructional strategies, preparedness, rapport with students, and professional demeanor.
Both cooperating and student teachers felt the forms were not useful, according to the interview data. For example, the student teacher from group three said, “These are supposed to be a reflection of how the week went. But they didn’t really do that. [The cooperating teacher] tried to think of things to write…and as time went on she started saying ‘another one of these’.” The cooperating teacher from group two said “Well I would say its kind of a 'you just have to do it' thing. We already talked about everything on the form.” Similarly the student teacher from group two said “These I didn’t need to look at because I already knew what I was working on that week.” Typically, cooperating and student teachers felt that this form was a superfluous communication that repeated what the pair already discussed. They also noted that there was little accountability to fill out and turn in the Weekly Progress and Reflection Report. The
student teacher from group one said, “I was told to turn these in each week, I never did and was never graded down. [The university] never asked about them. The cooperating teacher from group three said “I'm not sure that anyone even looked at them at all.” The student and cooperating teachers were aware that they were not going to be held accountable for completing and turning in these forms. This awareness, coupled with the view that the forms were simply a recap of the verbal feedback given during the week rendered them valueless to the cooperating and student teachers.

When asked in the interview about the Weekly Progress and Reflection Reports, the university supervisor reported occasionally reading these reports if the cooperating teacher happened to give one to her, but she stated:

It is not the supervisor's job to pick those up…They are so nebulous. Some cooperating teachers give them to the students, and the students ultimately are supposed to hand them in at seminar. They are also a documentation piece so if you are running into problems you can sit with the student teacher and say, you are not getting a credential.

The university supervisor felt the forms were not specific enough to provide her with substantial information about the student teacher’s progress. However, she viewed the forms as important documentation should a student teacher perform below expectations.

This tool had little value within each group for several reasons. All participants perceived it as a tool to be used outside the clinical practice group setting (in the student teachers’ seminar course) and not as a tool mediating action within the group. The university supervisor served as the representative of the university within the group, but she did not see herself as responsible for holding participants accountable for completing this form, and did not seem to value this tool beyond its function as evidence in the case of student teacher remediation. The student teachers reported that they were not held
accountable by their seminar instructor for turning in these forms. These factors may have led to the decreased use of these forms as mediators of student teacher learning.

**Student Teaching Formative Assessment Summary**

The Student Teaching Formative Assessment Summaries (see Appendix D) were used regularly as a debriefing tool by the university supervisor and the student teacher. Typically, the supervisor did not write comments concerning the student teachers’ weaknesses or suggestions for next steps. However, when she did write suggestions they tended to center around issues of classroom management and control. Student and cooperating teachers reported that overall, they did not use these forms to guide their practice.

The teacher preparation program required each supervisor to complete a Student Teaching Formative Assessment Summary during each observation of the student teachers. The university personnel designed this form according to the six California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Each of the six standards is listed on this form with a separate empty box labeled “Strengths/Evidence” and “Focus Areas/Next Steps” for the supervisors’ comments. The form was in triplicate with one copy for university records, one for the student teacher, and one for the cooperating teacher.

The university supervisor filled out one form each time she observed the student teacher. The university supervisor recorded evidence from the student teacher’s written lesson plan and/or performance in each of the six boxes under “Strengths/Evidence.” However, the boxes labeled “Focus Areas/Next Steps” were often left blank. On average, only 16% of “Focus Areas/Next Steps” boxes in the forms of all student teachers were completed with comments.
When the supervisor did include comments in the “Focus Areas/Next Steps” boxes, they were most often related to classroom management issues. Table 6 shows the standards for which the supervisor wrote comments in the “Focus Areas/Next Steps” boxes, the frequency of these comments, and examples of the types of comments in each.

Table 6: Supervisor Feedback on Student Teaching Formative Assessment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>% of Total “Next Steps” Comments</th>
<th>Examples of “Next Steps” Comments Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>“Go to the back by the door more often, lots of talking back there”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Shushing doesn’t work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Are you satisfied with student behavior today?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Don’t threaten.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Student Learning</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>“Will there be a summative assessment for this unit? If so, what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“What assessments are used to inform instruction?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>“You are addressing or interacting only with student who is talking”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“What do you need to do to have the students remain engaged? Maybe some student work on the board?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>“Catch kids with ear pieces in”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Work on knowing how students learn content best”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Brainstorm for theme ideas, this also allows you to check for understanding”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing as a Professional Educator</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>“Be sure to ask your cooperating teacher for help with TPA.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>“Be sure your lesson goal is articulated to the students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Is this the only standard? Are there more specific standards?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the interview the university supervisor said “I have to put something in every box. I focus on the ‘Engaging All Students’ and management boxes.” The documents show that she did focus in these areas, but that she did not always include comments in every box. There was a discrepancy between the way in which the supervisor understood the expectations for the use of the form and the way she carried out these expectations.
The supervisor also reported using these forms as a way to guide her debriefing discussion with student teachers after the observation. One student teacher noted, “[The university supervisor] would go through each one of the standards on the form and talk to me about what she saw.” The supervisor would then leave two copies of the form with the student teacher. One of the copies was for the cooperating teacher.

The university required the supervisors to use these forms when they observed student teachers in the field. The supervisor noted that the credential analyst for the school would verify the supervisors’ use of these forms before recommending a student teacher for a credential. Therefore this assessment tool was explicitly required and there was accountability for its use. These two reasons may account for the supervisor’s consistent use of these forms.

It is more difficult to understand the supervisor’s tendency to not comment in the “Focus Areas/Next Steps” boxes. One reason may be the dual nature of the supervisors’ role with the student teachers. She seems to think of herself as an evaluator and gatekeeper on one hand, and as a supporter and helper on the other. For example she said:

I am overseeing their program with the university to the point of are they becoming qualified to receive a credential through the work they are doing…My job is to come back to the university and say 'this student is ready to have a credential' or ‘this student is not.’ My job is to encourage and lift up and edify that student teacher and move them on where they feel confident with their experience, to help them.

Her view of herself as support and help to the student teacher seems to outweigh her role of evaluator as she seems reluctant to point out things the student teacher did not do well during the lesson. Additionally, the supervisor noted that she might tell other supervisors
“don't ever write anything on there you are going to regret because it will come back to haunt you.” This comment seems to indicate a hesitation to write something negative about a student teacher on a permanent record. The reasons for this hesitation are not clear from my data. Whatever the reason, the university and state expectations that this tool be used for formative assessment of the student teacher’s performance are only being partially met.

The supervisor’s tendency to write more about the student teacher’s needs in areas of classroom management connects to findings about the patterns of communication and interaction across all four groups. The verbal debriefings and written comments both tended to focus on issues of classroom control. The object of the activity as defined by the supervisor was to prepare a student teacher who can control a classroom. This focus may account for her tendency to write comments about classroom management in the “Focus Areas/Next Steps” boxes on this tool when she did write comments. I did not find the supervisor’s use of this tool to vary much between those groups in partnership with the university and those not in the partnerships.

The interview data also reveal how the participants used the assessment tool to think about and guide mentoring practices. Members of the clinical practice groups saw this form as a way to measure the student teacher’s performance against the California State Standards for the Teaching Profession. The university supervisor noted that the purpose of this form was:

To line up what the student teacher is doing with the standards, give evidence as documentation in case of a problem, to be a communication and reflection piece, and for the cooperating teachers to know that they are seeing the same things as I am regarding the student teacher’s performance.
Both the student teachers and the university supervisor reported using these forms to guide the debriefing conversations after the observation.

The cooperating teachers reported that the completed form was difficult to use as a mentoring tool because of the cooperating teachers’ discomfort with the language of the standards and their instantiation in the classroom. For example, the cooperating teacher from group one stated, “It is very specific and descriptive tool for [the supervisor] to use for judging the student teacher and it is based off of the standards and if you don't know what those are it is difficult to use these effectively.” In a similar fashion, the cooperating teacher from group two said “The university supervisor knows the standards very well, but the cooperating teachers do not, so I did not look at this with my student teacher often.” Further analysis of the data confirmed that the cooperating teachers typically did not use this form as a tool to guide their own mentoring practice with their student teachers.

The university and state expectation to formatively assess the student teachers based on the professional standards is evidenced by the way this tool is organized. Although the form was created in triplicate to ensure that the cooperating teacher received a copy, they do not see themselves as responsible for using these formative assessments to guide their mentoring practice. Instead, the cooperating teachers note that the university supervisor is solely responsible for working with the student teachers by using the standards. For example, the cooperating teacher from group one said, “She (the supervisor) knows the standards inside out and talks about them with [the student teacher]. I do not fill out those forms and the focus is not on looking at the standards.
The university requires that of [the supervisor] but we don’t do it.” Similarly, the cooperating teacher in group four noted, “I don’t think it is practical to judge how [the student teacher] is doing based on [the standards]. Now, [the supervisor] did a really good job of filling out those forms. I am here to just give general guidance.” Both the language of the standards and the individuals’ perceived roles within the groups appear to have created a distance between the cooperating teachers and the use of this tool during clinical practice.

The perception and use of this tool did not vary among partnership and non-partnership groups. The district administrator did not use or receive a copy of this formative assessment. The cooperating teachers in groups one and two did not differ in their use and perceptions of the formative assessment from those in the other groups. The cooperating teachers did, however, seem more aware that the language of the standards was difficult to translate into practice than the cooperating teachers not in the partnership.

**Mid-Term and Final Evaluations of Clinical Practice**

The Mid-Term and Final Evaluation forms were used to guide the triadic conversations among the university supervisor, student teacher, and cooperating teacher. While these forms prompted the cooperating teachers involved in the university-school partnership to communicate with the supervisor regarding the meaning of the language on these forms, they were typically not used to guide mentoring or instructional practices. The university supervisor and cooperating teachers often created their own system of scoring on these evaluations and did not follow the prescribed scoring instructions.

The university required that both the supervisor and cooperating teacher complete the Mid-term and Final Evaluations of Clinical Practice. These identical rubrics were
organized by each of the six California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The university program created a descriptive rubric of each standard to be scored on a scale from one to four (see Appendix E). The average of the scores of the items under each standard determined the student teacher’s overall score for that standard. Instructions on the rubrics indicated that if a student teacher received an average score of a one or two, he/she “will require additional remediation for licensure.” With an average score of three the student teacher “solidly meets proficiency levels for beginning teachers” while a four means that he/she “consistently meets advanced proficiency for beginning teachers on all standards.” These descriptions indicate that an average score below a three means that the student teacher did not meet the standard and may need to complete additional performance requirements and be re-evaluated.

As per university requirements the cooperating teachers completed both the midterm and final evaluations and met with the student teacher and university supervisor to discuss their scores. The university supervisor also completed the evaluations all four student teachers. The university program required these evaluations to be completed and discussed with the student teachers.

The mid-term and final evaluations were also used in ways not consistent with explicit university program requirements. For example, one of the purposes of the final evaluation was to determine if the student teacher was ready to enter the profession or if they “will require additional remediation for licensure” as stated on the form. The student teacher in group four received a mean score below three on the final evaluation for two of the standards. This student teacher, however, was not recommended by the supervisor as needing additional remediation. One reason for this discrepancy may be
that the supervisor saw herself as both evaluator and supporter to the student teachers, and the dominant role in this event was one of a supporter. This role as a supporter is further evidenced by the fact that the supervisor visited and observed the student teacher two additional times after the final evaluation meeting. It may be that these extra observations and feedback sessions served as remediation from the supervisor’s point of view.

Another way that the use of this assessment tool deviated from its intended purpose related to the scoring. The cooperating teachers and university supervisor sometimes used alternative scoring methods. For example, there are several cases where the evaluators gave a student teacher a score of 3.5 or 2.5 instead of using the whole numbers as requested. When asked about this practice, the cooperating teacher from group four said, “The difference between 3/4 is the word ‘consistently’…a lot of them could have gone either way, a three or four so who the heck knows.” This practice seems to result from the cooperating teacher’s confusion about what each score looks like in practice.

Additionally, the university supervisor wrote in “N/A” (not applicable) instead of a numerical score on a few items. The first instance of this occurred in clinical practice group three. The standard was titled “Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning” and the particular sub-description was “Instructional Practices for English Language Development.” The supervisor commented that, “the one marked “N/A” for the practices related to helping English Language Learners, well this is a Spanish class so that's not going to happen. Just mark it not applicable.” In this case, the content area dictated which standards were applicable for the evaluation of the student teacher.
The other instance occurred in clinical practice group four. Again, the standard was “Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning.” The supervisor wrote “N/A” in lieu of a score for both “Instructional Practices for English Language Development” and “Thinking Strategies to Make Subject Matter Meaningful.” The supervisor did not comment during the interview regarding this score. The student teacher who received the “N/A” was an art teacher in a fairly diverse middle school setting.

In both cases where the mentors assigned alternative scores, the rubric scoring design or standards did not meet the perceived scoring needs for that mentor. Upon recognizing this discrepancy, the mentors created their own scoring methods that diverged from the instrument’s intended use.

Also, these assessment tools developed to guide daily/weekly mentoring practices and student teacher experiences were not used in the way they were intended by the clinical practice groups. When discussing the ways in which she might use the midterm with her student teacher, the cooperating teacher from group two said:

Not all of the topics in here are really relevant, well of course relevant to being a good teacher, but some I think are more important than others. And I would focus on--like the ones on verbally assessing your students continuously throughout the period, also checking status at all times--those are the things I would work with her on all the time. I think the cooperating teacher should pick out a few that they think are really important to keeping the kids attention, keeping their grades up, and their understanding of the material and focus on those with the student teacher instead of really focusing on every one [standard] in detail.

This cooperating teacher felt that particular standards were more important than others and that the cooperating teacher should be the person who determines the focus for the student teacher. She does not indicate that the scores from the midterm evaluation should serve as a tool to mediate student teacher learning.
Similarly, the cooperating teacher from clinical practice group four said of the midterm evaluation form, “I put it in my student teacher file to keep if I need to refer to it later, and I will keep it in case [the student teacher] ever needed it...if something got lost or whatever.” This cooperating teacher saw the form as something to store for record-keeping purposes, but not as a tool to guide her mentoring practice or the student teacher’s experiences in the classroom.

This assessment tool had the potential to help student teachers reflection their practice within the clinical practice group. The student teacher from group one said, “After the mid-term the forms sat on my desk all year and I didn't look at them.” Similarly, the student teacher from group three said, “We only used those forms twice. We really didn’t use them outside of the midterm and final meetings.” The student teachers’ midterm evaluation could have guided student teacher practice and mentoring until the final evaluation.

According to the university and state expectations for clinical practice, even if this particular tool does not serve as a daily/weekly mediating tool for student teacher learning, another standards-based tool should.

The cooperating teachers in the university-school partnership groups (one and two) expressed concern about understanding the language of the standards in the midterm and final evaluation. For example, the cooperating teacher in clinical practice group one said:

This [the evaluation form] is a tougher piece to understand because language between the standards and what the student teachers are dealing with on a day to day basis... that language doesn’t always match up— These are the standards they are being evaluated on, but in a classroom environment...what would the standard look like? I wouldn’t be able to
score [my student teacher] the same with my understanding of the standard.

Similarly, the cooperating teacher from group two said, “I wasn’t really sure what was expected from the student teacher based on the standards’ language.” These quotes reveal that these cooperating teachers felt that the language of the standards and practice in the classroom were different. The cooperating teachers did not think or talk about classroom practice in the way practice was described in the standards. The cooperating teachers in these groups reported requesting a meeting with the university supervisor in order to better understand how to use these evaluation forms to assess the student teachers. During this meeting, the cooperating teacher from group one said:

[The university supervisor] went through each standard and explained what she was looking for. I tried to write them down as she explained. So I would give my student teacher my notes and say ‘this is what they are looking for.’ She put these standards into more general terms to make it easier for me to score [the student teacher].

The university supervisor seemed to serve as a translator by helping the cooperating teachers understand what the standards looked like in practice. The university supervisor said, “Within the partnership we have had time to sit down and go over this document, because I think it is the most difficult document to understand, it is unfair to them it is unfair to the student if they don't have a good understanding of it.” The goal of this meeting was to create a shared understanding of the language of the standards and how this language related to a score for the student teachers. The cooperating teachers from clinical practice groups outside of the university-school partnership did not express concern about their understanding of the language in the standards. They did not meet with the university supervisor to attempt to create a shared understanding of the language.
Explicit expectations and accountability measures may account for the cooperating teachers’ commitment to use of this tool to evaluate their student teachers. The university explicitly required the cooperating teachers to serve as evaluators using this tool as both a formative and summative assessment. The university personnel also expected that the supervisor hold a meeting with the cooperating and student teachers to review these assessments.

The partnership arrangement between the university and school did make a difference in the way the groups used the mid-term and final evaluation tools. It may be that the cooperating teachers in the school-university partnership groups expressed more concern about understanding the use of this tool because of the commitment they made before the semester to bridging the gap between the university expectations and their own expectations. This tool seemed to afford these cooperating teachers the opportunity to clearly understand one difference between the university culture and the culture of the classroom teacher. The cooperating teachers looked to the university supervisor to help them understand how the standards translated into classroom practice.

Even though there was an attempt to reach a shared understanding of the use of the university midterm and final assessment tools, the cooperating teachers who worked within the school-university partnership groups (groups one and two) did not necessarily demonstrate an increase in the number of midterm and final evaluation scores that were similar to the university supervisor. Table 7 shows the percentage of individual items that were scored the same by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.
Table 7: Percentage of Rubric Items Scored Similarly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University-School Site Partners</th>
<th>Not University-School Site Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cooperating teachers’ awareness of their difficulty with the language of the standards and the subsequent meeting with the supervisor may not ultimately have made a difference in the student teachers’ evaluation.

Another way clinical practice groups in the university-school partnership differed from the other groups was the cooperating and student teachers’ use of the midterm and final evaluations before the evaluation meeting with the supervisor. Both of the cooperating teachers in groups one and two reported sitting down with their student teachers before the meeting with the supervisor to discuss the language of the standards and the student teachers’ scores. The cooperating teacher from group one said, “The day before [the university supervisor] was coming we would sit down and talk about it for two reasons. One, I wanted to see where he thought he was. Two, I wanted him to know where I was so that when we have this discussion (with the supervisor) he is not surprised, to be as transparent as possible.” Similarly, the student teacher in group two said, “She and I talked through each of [the standards], like what would be an example of that, or what would not, or I think that you are not doing this.” Again, the groups not involved in the university-school partnership did not report using the midterm and final assessment tools in this way.

The intended use of this assessment tool is to provide the mentors with a standards-based rubric to evaluate the readiness of the student teacher to enter the
profession. The implicit expectation is that these standards guide the mentoring practices with the student teachers throughout the semester. The cooperating teachers working within the clinical practice groups examined in this study generally did not use this tool or the standards framework to guide their daily debriefings and mentoring practices. However, the fact that the cooperating teachers in the partnerships attempted to use the standards-based rubric as a reflection tool with their student teachers may show that the tool in combination with the partnership expectations allowed for a more robust use of these assessments and the beginnings of standards-based practice (not just standards-based evaluation). The cooperating teachers’ use of this tool before the evaluation meeting signals a step in that direction.

**California Teacher Performance Assessment (Cal-TPA)**

Overall, the Cal-TPA was not regularly used as a tool to guide mentoring or student teacher instruction. Two of the student teachers in the university-district partnership reported seeking help from their cooperating teachers on ways to implement some of the required adaptations to their lessons for diverse students. However, the data indicate that communication about adaptations in instruction did not remain a focus of mentoring or instruction outside of the conversations driven by the assessment tool.

California Senate Bill 2042 in 1998 required all candidates for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials to pass an assessment of teaching performance based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. In 2008, the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing approved three performance assessments to be used statewide. The first was the Cal-TPA, developed by the Educational Testing Service in conjunction with CCTC. The other approved assessments include the
Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), and the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST).

Teacher education programs across the state were charged with facilitating student teacher completion of these performance assessments during their field placements. The clinical practice groups examined in this study were among the first groups to work with student teachers who were required to pass a performance assessment in order to receive a credential.

The Cal-TPA is divided into four separate tests or tasks designed to be taken in order. Table 8 shows the focus and requirements in each task.

Table 8: California Teacher Performance Assessment Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Classroom Placement Required?</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Subject-Specific Pedagogy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Four case studies that require candidate to relate subject matter knowledge and understanding of K-12 student standards to particular teaching methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Designing Instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Candidate is required to make connections between students in her class and instructional planning. Two focus students must be identified and instructional accommodations must be made for them. The lesson is not required to be taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Assessing Learning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Candidate is required to design, implement, and evaluate the effectiveness of appropriate assessment activities. Two focus students must be identified and assessment accommodations must be made for them. The assessments must be implemented. Candidate reflects on performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Culminating Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Candidate designs, implements, and video-records a lesson. Two focus students must be identified and accommodations must be made for them. Assessments are designed and implemented. Candidate reflects on his/her performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student teachers in this study had already completed tasks one and two before they began working in their clinical practice groups. They were required to complete
tasks three and four during the 20-week placement examined in this study. Their university course instructor was in charge of disseminating the information to aid the student teachers in the completion and submission of these two tasks. The university supervisor and cooperating teachers in each of the clinical practice groups were aware of this requirement, but were not expected by the state or the university to participate directly in the completion of these tasks.

Student teachers from each of the four clinical practice groups passed the CalTPA tasks three and four. However, only two reported using the Cal-TPA as a tool to mediate learning. The cooperating teacher from group two said:

We talked about her TPA focus students. We worked together and made a sheet, a handout, and the ELL kids actually did way better. And I was like, wow that's cool. It actually worked. Just giving them a little push or stepping stool. That was the only [accommodation] we could figure out to do. I didn't know what else to do.

The student teacher in group three reported, “I had to ask for help with some of my TPA work because I was required to do a lot more in the TPA than what we typically did in the classroom.” These accounts show that the CalTPA tasks did afford opportunities for learning. These are, however, the only two instances in the data of the CalTPA being used by the clinical practice groups.

**Summary**

The university designed assessment tools introduced into each clinical practice group were used in a variety of ways. Generally, these tools were employed for summative or formative evaluation; however decisions about mentoring strategies, focus areas, and daily practice did not seem to be based on information from these tools. Also, the assessment tool designed for use outside of the clinical practice group was not valued
and used the least by the cooperating and student teacher. Overall, the evaluation forms were used as prescribed by the university with a few exceptions, including the creation of alternate scoring systems on the assessments that required the mentors to grade the student teacher on a rubric. Finally, the tool containing the language of the professional standards did prompt the cooperating teachers working within the university-school partnership to become concerned with their ability to accurately judge student teacher performance. These cooperating teachers took steps to better understand the intended use of the assessment tool.

Discussion

The overall question that guided this research was: How are state and university expectations for clinical practice in teacher education, including standards-based preparation and university-school partnerships, enacted through patterns of communication and the use of assessment tools in a clinical practice group activity setting? The findings related to the two sub-questions offer some insight into how expectations and requirements concerning standards-based teacher preparation and university-school partnerships influenced the daily practice of student teachers and their mentors in the field.

Activity theory helped to make sense of these findings in terms of the reform effort to professionalize teacher education. The actors, tools, goals, communities, rules, and division of labor were considered together and in relation to one another. Therefore the setting was the unit of analysis instead of the individual (Engeström, 2001). Figure
10 shows the ways in which the clinical practice group settings examined in this study were mapped onto the basic framework of activity theory.

Figure 10: The Clinical Practice Group Activity Setting

The subjects in the activity setting included each participant of the clinical practice group. The cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and district administrator observed, mentored, or evaluated the student teacher’s performance in the classroom. Each of these participants belonged to a specific community. The university supervisor worked for the teacher preparation program that the student teachers attended while pursuing their credentials. The cooperating teachers worked as regular classroom teachers in the school sites in which their student teachers were placed. The district
administrator was headquartered in the district office where she was responsible for coordinating new teacher induction for the district.

The expectations, or rules, entailed by the professionalization movement in teacher education were absorbed, enacted, ignored, or transformed by the clinical practice groups in different ways. The enactment of these expectations was closely connected to four aspects of the activity setting: the communities that made up setting, the nature of the expectations (rules), the division of labor among the participants, and goal of the activity.

**Standards-Based Preparation in Clinical Practice Group Settings**

I treated the expectation for standards-based student teacher preparation as a rule within the clinical practice activity setting. The findings related to the patterns of communication and tool use within each clinical practice group indicate that this rule (standards-based clinical practice) was influenced by the participants’ beliefs concerning the object, division of labor, and communities within these activity settings.

**The Object of the Setting and Standards-Based Preparation**

The participants reported that the primary object of clinical practice (see Figure 10) was to prepare a student teacher who could effectively manage procedures and behavior in the classroom. I found patterns of communication and tool use within each group that tended to reflect this definition of the object. For example, the cooperating teachers and university supervisor focused the majority of their written and verbal feedback about student teacher performance on issues concerning classroom management. The cooperating teacher and supervisor tended to spend less time
communicating with the student teachers as they demonstrated competence in this area. These patterns support the notion that the primary object of the clinical practice activity was perceived as preparing a student teacher to have control of the classroom.

One of the rules introduced into the activity settings examined in this study was for student teachers to practice and demonstrate competence across all six professional teaching standards during clinical practice. However, only one of these standards was defined as the overall goal, or object, of the activity. This contradicts the expectation introduced into each setting that the student teacher should practice and demonstrate competence across all six professional teaching standards. It may be that the way the participants defined the object of teacher preparation had an effect on the narrow focus in both communication and tool use instead of a broader focus on all elements contained in the standards.

**The Division of Labor and Standards-Based Preparation**

Participant beliefs concerning the division of labor within the setting (see Figure 10) might have contributed to patterns of communication and the use of standards for guiding student teacher learning within the group. For instance, the cooperating teachers who did not work within the university-school partnership deemed the university supervisor to be primarily responsible for using the standards in working with the student teachers. The beliefs about the division of labor within the activity setting may have contributed to these cooperating teachers’ narrow focus on classroom management with their student teachers. It could also be argued that the cooperating teachers did not see the value in communicating with the supervisor because they believed she served a fundamentally different function within the setting.
This notion was substantiated by the fact that the two cooperating teachers involved in the university-school partnership communicated more with the university supervisor when they were concerned about evaluating the student teachers’ use of the language of the standards. However, these cooperating teachers did not regularly communicate with the supervisor or to extend their interest in the standards beyond evaluation. The cooperating teachers in the partnership groups agreed to bridge the gap between university expectations and school site expectations for student teacher learning. It seems as if this agreement led the cooperating teachers to pursue clarification on the standards. The fact that these cooperating teachers sought help from the supervisor about using the standards showed that they felt a shared responsibility due to the partnership expectations. This sense of a shared responsibility may indicate that the way these cooperating teachers understood the division of labor was different than the beliefs of the cooperating teachers who did not work in the university-school partnership groups.

Overall, it seems that standards-based student teacher preparation in the field was influenced by mentor beliefs concerning whose responsibility it was to use the standards during clinical practice.

*The Community and Standards-Based Preparation*

In addition to the object and division of labor in the settings, the communities within each setting (see Figure 10) seemed to play a part in the use of the standards-based tools to guide student teacher evaluation. In particular, the content area in which the student teacher was practicing and the community to which the mentor belonged (university or school) influenced the enactment of standards-based student teacher preparation. For instance, the supervisor relied on the content area to dictate which
standards on the evaluation forms were not applicable for assessing the student teachers’ performance. The student teacher who was preparing in a Spanish classroom was not evaluated on the standard addressing adaptations for language learners. The supervisor reported in her interview “Well, this is a Spanish class so that isn’t going to happen.” The community in which the student teacher was situated (content area) impacted the perceived importance of certain standards. Additionally, the classroom teachers were found to feel uncomfortable with using the language of the standards with their student teachers, while the supervisor was found to understand and use the language of the standards with ease. It may be that the community from which the mentor belonged (school or university) influenced standards-based practice.

**University-School Partnerships in Clinical Practice Group Settings**

The state outcomes concerning partnerships did not penetrate the rules of the clinical practice activity settings and therefore seemed to have little influence on the practices within these groups. On the other hand, the university expectations regarding partnerships were found to impact some aspects of group activity. The participants’ beliefs about the division of labor and the design of assessment tools seemed to influence the enactment of partnership practices in clinical practice group activity.

**The Division of Labor and Partnership Practices**

The district administrator observed and communicated with the student teachers regarding their performance in the classroom. However, she did not communicate with other members of the clinical practice group, or use the assessment tools to evaluate the student teachers. The district administrator defined her role in these settings as a mentor
who was there to provide the point of view of a district office employee who was in charge of hiring new teachers. She did not see herself as a collaborator with other members of the group, or an evaluator of student teacher performance. The perception of her role impacted her communication and use of the assessment tools within the groups.

The cooperating teachers involved in the university-school partnership groups did collaborate with the supervisor in order to better understand the application of the standards in classroom practice. These cooperating teachers understood their role as evaluator of student teacher performance as being closely connected to understanding university expectations for standards-based evaluation. This understanding impacted the collaborative practice between the cooperating teachers and the supervisor.

*Assessment Tools and Partnership Practices*

The design of the assessment tools and the rules regarding their use seemed to have the most influence on the ways in which the university-school partnership groups operated. For instance, the two cooperating teachers involved in this partnership reported that the language on the mid-term and final evaluation was difficult to translate into student teacher practice. This difficulty of applying the language along with the university rules regarding this partnership seemed to prompt the cooperating teachers to collaborate with the university supervisor. The clinical practice groups not involved in the university-school partnership did not demonstrate a similar use of the mid-term and final evaluation.
Summary

When examined through the conceptual lens of activity theory, the patterns of communication and interaction found in each of the four clinical practice groups help us understand the influence of university and state expectations within the clinical practice groups. It may be that the participants’ perceptions of their roles within the group along with their beliefs about the overall objective of student teacher learning impact the ways in which the state and university outcomes and expectations play out in the activities of these groups. Additionally, the communities in which the student teachers practice also impact the ways in which clinical practice groups operate in relation to expectations.

The findings and discussion presented in this chapter have the potential to influence the design of future clinical practice settings while offering insight into the relationships between reform efforts and their enactment in teacher education.
Chapter 6-Conclusion

Programs that prepare future teachers have become the focus of current reform efforts due to the urgency to place highly qualified teachers in classrooms. The movement to professionalize teacher education calls for an increase in standards and accountability. Educational policy-makers and practitioners debate whether professionalization or deregulation of education would better serve this purpose. Proponents of deregulation argue that professionalization prevents highly qualified people from becoming teachers due to the increase in credit hours, field experience, and performance evaluations that professionalization requires of teachers. However, nationwide legislation calling for mandatory standards-based teacher performance assessments persists. Despite the debate over professionalization of teacher education, reforms continue to mandate the use of standards to prepare new teachers and recommend the increase in collaboration between university programs and K-12 schools.

This study uses Activity Theory as a conceptual lens through which to consider the social aspects of clinical practice and add to the current knowledge in this field by focusing on the impact of the reform movement to professionalize teacher education in these settings. In particular, this study focuses on the state and university expectations and outcomes for standards-based practice and evaluation, as well as expectations related to partnership arrangements between the university and schools.

Four clinical practice groups, each composed of the student teacher and those who observe, mentor, or evaluate the student teacher in the field, were chosen to participate. The study took place over the 20-week semester during which the student teachers were
required to practice teaching in the classroom. The overarching research question in this study was: How do expectations related to professionalization influence the group members’ communication and interaction as well as their use of tools such as formative and summative assessments? In order to answer this question, participants were asked to fill out a daily questionnaire for three weeks. This questionnaire required participants to record the frequency, length, and content of their communication with other members of the clinical practice group. Another data source was individual interviews. During these interviews, participants viewed a video of the student teacher instructing a class, and the participants were asked to talk about communication and tool use. Finally, documents found in the student teacher’s university file were collected and analyzed.

The patterns of communication and tool use in each of the four clinical practice groups demonstrate ways in which elements related to the reform movement to professionalize teacher education were enacted in the daily practice of preparing student teachers in K-12 classrooms. The California Standards for the Teaching Profession were intended to be the foundation upon which student teacher practice and evaluation were based. The standards did seem to guide the evaluation of student teacher performance; however the evaluation tools were sometimes used in ways other than they were originally intended. These changes served to privilege particular standards over others. Also, classroom management issues dominated communication about performance while balanced discussions concerning professional teaching standards seemed to be relegated to the mandatory mid-term and final evaluation meetings only.

Another tenet of professionalization is the formation of university-school partnerships to foster increased collaboration between university and school site
personnel in the training of student teachers in the field. The university recommendation that the district administrator observe and debrief the student teachers was evident in the partnership groups’ patterns of communication. However, I did not find evidence congruent with the state expectations that the district administrator and university personnel worked to develop, implement, and evaluate the clinical practice program. The findings related to the communication and use of tools in the university-school partnership indicated increased collaboration of cooperating teachers to develop a shared understanding of evaluation tools.

The participants’ understanding of their roles within the group along with their beliefs about the overall objective of student teacher learning impacted the ways in which the state and university outcomes and expectations influenced the dynamic of these groups. Furthermore, the communities in which the student teachers practice seem also to influence the ways in which clinical practice groups operate in relation to expectations.

These findings may help guide future research on clinical practice and inform the design and implementation of university programs to create a successful field experience component.

Limitations of this Study

My position as a full time teacher imposed restrictions on the data collection strategies available to me as I explored my research questions. I could not be present to observe and record group interactions and tool use as they occurred in the field. Therefore, most of the data collected and analyzed consisted of self-reports that required the participants to recall their communication and tool use after some time had elapsed. Other data collection strategies helped to mitigate this limitation such as daily on-line
questionnaires, interviews that included video-elicited talk about student teacher practice, and documents that captured the mentors’ written feedback and evaluations at various points during the semester.

My inability to be present as the groups worked also affected the range of mediating tools I could analyze. This study focuses solely on assessment tools as mediators of student teacher learning. I was not able to observe or record the participants’ use of tools related to subject-specific instruction such as textbooks, nor was I able to collect data regarding how language mediated student teacher learning. However, the assessment tools were very helpful in examining how student teacher learning was mediated within the groups. The tools were similar across all four clinical practice groups: they tended to use the language of the standards and they were helpful in eliciting participant talk about the ways in which these tools were used to evaluate and guide student teacher learning.

Directions for Further Research

The limitations of this study also suggest new directions for future research. One way to pursue a better understanding of clinical practice in teacher education would be to focus on the ways language and other mediating tools are incorporated into the daily practice of preparing teachers in K-12 classrooms. This could strengthen our understanding of the ways in which elements of the setting work together to influence the enactment of particular outcomes.

Researchers might consider the university seminar instructors as members of the clinical practice group. This would allow for an opportunity to examine the ways in
which expectations for university course assignments and learning are incorporated into student teacher practice and learning in the field. Although studies have sought to understand how knowledge transfers from teacher education courses into practice, few studies define the activity setting of clinical practice as the unit of analysis. By making the setting the unit of analysis in these cases, we may be able to learn more about the transfer of knowledge from university coursework.

Future research could help us better understand how partnership agreements help to shape the group members’ understanding of the overall object of clinical practice and of their own roles and responsibilities within these settings. Findings from this study indicate that partnerships may play a key role in changing the fundamental ways in which individuals function within clinical practice settings.

**Implications for the Design of Clinical Practice Programs**

The findings and discussion presented here may be useful to those who design teacher preparation programs as they comply with state and national policies and expectations for the preparation of student teachers in the field including standards-based practice and collaborative partnerships.

The discussion in this study indicates that it may be necessary to help mentors and student teachers working in the field reconceptualize their individual responsibilities within the setting as well as the overall goals of student teaching according to professional standards. It is, however, difficult to change individual beliefs. Therefore, programs should consider settings in which individuals engage in activities across the
university and school community boundaries and prepare teachers who are competent across all professional teaching standards.

A practical way for preparation programs to design effective clinical practice settings is to consider the design of both formative and summative assessment tools, the expectations for the use of these tools, and the accountability measures that hold individuals within the setting responsible for their use. For example, it might be useful to organize these tools according to the language of the standards, and to require the completion of an assessment that requires input from both university and school site personnel. This may encourage more collaborative interactions and affect the ways participants think about their individual roles and responsibilities. Once all members of the clinical practice setting, including the student teachers, begin to use these tools in collaboration with one another, their individual understandings about the outcomes of clinical practice may move closer to a collaborative and standards-based goal of teacher preparation.

**Final Thoughts**

The daily opportunities for K-12 students to engage in vigorous intellectual and social activities must be at the heart of research and reform in teacher education. To make the most of these opportunities, it is imperative to provide these students with the qualified professionals in the classroom.

The research presented here asked questions about the ways in which reforms aimed toward improving teacher education impact the ways prospective teachers are prepared during clinical practice. For most teachers, clinical practice is the first and sometimes the only opportunity they have to work closely with experienced educators.
who mentor and evaluate their performance in the classroom. Clinical practice is therefore a critical aspect of teacher education that deserves to be in the forefront of teacher education discourse. It is also important to understand the ways in which reform efforts play out in the daily practice of student teachers and their mentors.

As programs that prepare teachers are increasingly faced with pressures from policy makers and accreditation institutions, they will need practical and effective ways to design and evaluate their own programs to ensure quality teacher preparation is truly taking place. An increased understanding of the social contexts in which teachers are prepared will help to develop a rich knowledge-base about the most effective teacher preparation practices and help ensure the enactment of the most effective practices on the ground.
Appendix A-California Standards for the Teaching Profession
### California Standards for the Teaching Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD ONE: ENGAGING &amp; SUPPORTING ALL STUDENTS IN LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Connecting students' prior knowledge, life experience, and interests with learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Using a variety of instructional strategies and resources to respond to students' diverse needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Facilitating learning experiences that promote autonomy, interaction, and choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Engaging students in problem solving, critical thinking, and other activities that make subject matter meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Promoting self-directed, reflective learning for all students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD TWO: CREATING &amp; MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Creating a physical environment that engages all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Establishing a climate that promotes fairness and respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Promoting social development and group responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Establishing and maintaining standards for student behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Planning and implementing classroom procedures and routines that support student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Using instructional time effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD THREE: UNDERSTANDING &amp; ORGANIZING SUBJECT MATTER FOR STUDENT LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Demonstrating knowledge of subject matter content and student development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Organizing curriculum to support student understanding of subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Interrelating ideas and information within and across subject matter areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Developing student understanding through instructional strategies that are appropriate to the subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Using materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD FOUR: PLANNING INSTRUCTION &amp; DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES FOR ALL STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Drawing on and valuing students' backgrounds, interests, and developmental learning needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Establishing and articulating goals for student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Developing and sequencing instructional activities and materials for student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Designing short-term and long-term plans to foster student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Modifying instructional plans to adjust for student needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD FIVE: ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Establishing and communicating learning goals for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Collecting and using multiple sources of information to assess student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Involving and guiding all students in assessing their own learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Using the results of assessments to guide instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Communicating with students, families, and other audiences about student progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD SIX: DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Reflecting on teaching practice and planning professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Establishing professional goals and pursuing opportunities to grow professionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Working with communities to improve professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Working with families to improve professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Working with colleagues to improve professional practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B-Daily Communication Questionnaire

There were four versions of the Daily Communication Questionnaires, one version for each participant in the clinical practice group. The versions differed only in the omission of questions about communication with the participant who was filling out the questionnaire. For example, the cooperating teacher version did not include questions about communication with the cooperating teacher. The questionnaire included in this appendix is a sample of the cooperating teacher version.
## Cooperating Teacher

### 1. Identifying Information and Date

1. I am....
   - [$] CT 1
   - [$] CT 2
   - [$] CT 3
   - [$] CT 4

2. If you are entering information about communications that took place on a day other than today, please provide the date below.

### 2. Communication with your student teacher

1. Did you communicate with your student teacher today?
   - [$] yes
   - [$] no

### 3. Communication with your student teacher

Please answer the following questions regarding your communication with your student teacher today.

1. In what way(s) did you and your student teacher communicate today? (Check all that apply)
   - [$] face-to-face
   - [$] email/text message
   - [$] phone
   - Other (please specify)

2. What was the approximate amount of time (in minutes) you spent in your student teacher’s presence today?

3. What was the approximate amount of time (in minutes) you spent communicating with your student teacher throughout the day?
### Cooperating Teacher

4. Approximately how much time (in minutes) did you spend observing your student teacher today?  

5. What was/were the topic(s) of the communication with your student teacher today? (Check all that apply)
   - lesson planning
   - lesson delivery
   - classroom management
   - individual students
   - individual classes
   - classroom procedures
   - school procedures
   - obtaining and using resources
   - university procedures
   - university course assignments
   - university assessments
   - scheduling
   - the student teacher’s future career
   - the student teacher’s future learning goals
   - topics unrelated to teaching
   - Other (please specify)

6. Were any resources/tools (i.e. documents, forms, websites, etc) used during the communication with your student teacher?  
   - □ yes
   - □ no

4.  

   1. Describe the use of the resources/tools (documents, forms, websites, books, etc.) used during the communication with your student teacher.
### Cooperating Teacher

5. Describe your attitude, beliefs, and/or feelings about the communication with your student teacher.

### University Supervisor Communication

6. Did you communicate with the university supervisor today?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

### Communication with University Supervisor (US)

Please answer the following questions about the communication you had today with the university supervisor.

1. In what way(s) did you and your university supervisor communicate today? (Check all that apply)

- [ ] face-to-face
- [ ] email
- [ ] phone

Other (please specify):

- [ ]

2. What was the approximate amount of time (in minutes) you spent communicating with your university supervisor today?

- [ ]
Cooperating Teacher

3. What was/were the topic(s) of the communication with your university supervisor today? (Check all that apply)

☐ lesson planning
☐ lesson delivery
☐ classroom management
☐ individual students
☐ individual classes
☐ classroom procedures
☐ school procedures
☐ obtaining and using resources
☐ university procedures
☐ university course assignments
☐ university assessments
☐ scheduling
☐ the student teacher’s future career
☐ the student teacher’s future learning goals
☐ coaching and mentoring strategies and techniques
☐ issues unrelated to the student teacher

Other (please specify)

4. Were resources such as documents, forms, websites, books, etc. used during the communication with the university supervisor?

☐ yes
☐ no

5. Describe the use of the resources/tools (documents, forms, websites, books, etc.) used during the communication with the university supervisor.


6. Describe your attitude, beliefs, and/or feelings about the communication with the university supervisor.


### Cooperating Teacher

#### 8. Communication with Cindy Douglas (District Administrator)

1. Did you communicate with the district administrator today?
   - [ ] yes
   - [ ] no

#### 9. Communication with the District Administrator

Please answer the following questions about your communication with the district administrator.

1. **In what way(s) did you and the district administrator communicate today?** (Check all that apply)
   - [ ] face-to-face
   - [ ] email
   - [ ] phone
   - Other (please specify):
     - 

2. **What was the approximate amount of time you spent communicating with the district administrator today?**
   - 

Cooperating Teacher

3. What was/were the topic(s) of the communication with the district administrator today? (Check all that apply)

☐ lesson planning
☐ lesson delivery
☐ classroom management
☐ individual students
☐ individual classes
☐ classroom procedures
☐ school procedures
☐ obtaining and using resources
☐ university procedures
☐ university course assignments
☐ university assessments
☐ scheduling
☐ the student teacher’s future career
☐ the student teacher’s future learning goals
☐ coaching/mentoring strategies
☐ issues unrelated to the student teacher

Other (please specify) ____________________________________________

4. Where any resources or tools used during the communication with the district administrator today? (documents, forms, standards rubric, website, etc.)?

☐ yes
☐ no

10. Description of Resources and Tools -District Administrator

1. Describe the use of resources/tools (documents, websites, forms, books, etc.) used during the communication with Cindy Douglas today.

________________________________________________________________________

11. 
### Cooperating Teacher

1. Describe your attitudes, beliefs, and/or feelings about the communication with the district administrator today?

### 12. Additional Comments Regarding Your Communications Today

1. Did you talk to anyone else today about your student teaching experience? If so, please list their names and a brief description of their relationship to you.

2. Please use this space to make any additional comments about today's communications that you think might be helpful. OPTIONAL
Appendix C-Weekly Progress and Reflection Report
(To Be Completed by the Master Teacher)

WEEKLY PROGRESS AND REFLECTION REPORT

Candidate: ___________________ Master Teacher: ___________________

Placement: ________________ Week #: __________ Dates: From __________ to __________

Part One: Overall Progress Rating By Master Teacher

Completed by the Master Teacher, the intent of the "Overall Progress Rating" is to provide a weekly summary of the teacher candidate’s demonstration of professional attributes essential to success in a placement and the teaching profession. (Rating Key: The abbreviations used for ratings are: U= unacceptable, I= inconsistent, A= acceptable, C= Consistent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality (Met established time requirements for arrival, meetings and conferences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (Evidence of thoughtful and thorough preparation of lesson plans as well as having appropriate materials and resources selected and available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (Demonstrated knowledge of subject matter content and student development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (Receptive to suggestions and feedback; discussed and reflected proactively about observations, interactions and own teaching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(As appropriate, an additional attribute may be added and rated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initialed by the Master Teacher

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D-Student Teacher Formative Assessment Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strengths/Evidence</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus Areas/Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for ALL Students (TPE 8, 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning (TPE 10, 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>I.D.#</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging and Supporting ALL Students in Learning (TPE 4,5,6,7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible for Student Learning (TPE 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Student Learning (TPE 2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 12, 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E-Mid-term and Final Evaluations of Clinical Practice
Mid-Term Evaluation of Clinical Practice:
Clinical Practice I & II
(Recreated from Original)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credential Candidate:</td>
<td>Master Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Supervisor:</td>
<td>School:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Completed by:</td>
<td>Signature:________________________</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: Review each Candidate Proficiency [sic]. Based on a review of evidence from multiple sources over a period of time mark the box in the column that best describes the candidate’s current level of proficiency.

Next Steps: Based on an analysis of all sources of assessment, jointly establish a few focus areas (goals) for professional development. Develop a professional development plan and timeline and identify the resources and support required to ensure significant progress toward achieving professional development goals.
CSTP: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students
The candidate learns about his/her students and uses this information to plan instruction
and assessment, as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Goals and State Adopted Content</td>
<td>Establishing clear and appropriate long and short term</td>
<td>Shows little or</td>
<td>Establishes</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>goals for student learning based on state-adopted</td>
<td>no evidence of</td>
<td>somewhat ambiguous</td>
<td>and communicate</td>
<td>establishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frameworks and academic content standards for students</td>
<td>establishing or</td>
<td>academic learning</td>
<td>academic learning</td>
<td>and communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communicatiing</td>
<td>goals partially</td>
<td>goals aligned with</td>
<td>clear and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clear learning</td>
<td>aligned with state</td>
<td>state adopted</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>goals or alignment</td>
<td>adopted content</td>
<td>content standards</td>
<td>academic learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with state-adopted</td>
<td>standards and</td>
<td>to students</td>
<td>goals aligned with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>content standards</td>
<td>communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td>state adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s these goals to</td>
<td></td>
<td>content standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students in a</td>
<td></td>
<td>to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cursory manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information About Students</td>
<td>Obtaining detailed and relevant information about the</td>
<td>Obtains little</td>
<td>Obtains somewhat</td>
<td>Obtains accurate</td>
<td>Consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>class as a whole and about selected students</td>
<td>or not information</td>
<td>cursory information</td>
<td>and relevant</td>
<td>obtains detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>about students’</td>
<td>about students’</td>
<td>information about</td>
<td>and relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>backgrounds</td>
<td>backgrounds</td>
<td>students’ backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Plan and Rationale</td>
<td>Planning relevant and appropriate instruction (with</td>
<td>Inappropriately</td>
<td>Ambiguously</td>
<td>Accurately and</td>
<td>Consistently,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate rationale in relation to the content area</td>
<td>addresses the</td>
<td>addresses some</td>
<td>appropriately</td>
<td>coherently and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with</td>
<td>components of the</td>
<td>components of the</td>
<td>addresses most</td>
<td>completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>state-adopted frameworks and academic content</td>
<td>instructional plan</td>
<td>instruction plan</td>
<td>components of the</td>
<td>addresses all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards</td>
<td>missing components</td>
<td>with somewhat</td>
<td>instruction plan</td>
<td>components of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inappropriate</td>
<td>cursory rationale</td>
<td>with appropriate</td>
<td>instruction plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td>rationale</td>
<td>with relevant and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>detailed rationale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The candidate learns about his/her students and uses this information to plan instruction and assessment, as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptations to support learning for all students</td>
<td>Selecting and adapting relevant and appropriate instructional strategies, grouping strategies and instructional materials to assist students to achieve learning goals and meet all students’ needs</td>
<td>Uses inappropriate or no adaptations, providing little or no evidence of understanding of differentiation for ELL and special needs students</td>
<td>Uses minimally appropriate adaptations demonstrating limited understanding of differentiation for ELL and special needs students</td>
<td>Accurately and appropriately uses adaptations demonstrating basic understanding of differentiation for ELL and special needs students</td>
<td>Consistently uses relevant and appropriate adaptations demonstrating accurate understanding of differentiation for ELL and special needs students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSTP: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning
The candidate establishes a climate for learning and uses instructional time appropriately as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Time</td>
<td>Allocating instructional time appropriately</td>
<td>Inappropriately or inaccurately estimates time allocations for instructional time: may fail to set time allocations</td>
<td>Inconsistently, sometimes appropriately sometimes inappropriately estimates allocations for instructional plan</td>
<td>Accurately estimates most time allocations for instructional plan</td>
<td>Consistently, appropriately, and accurately estimates time allocations (pacing) for instructional plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for Routine Tasks and Transitions</td>
<td>Establishing clear and appropriate procedures for routine tasks and managing transitions to maximize instructional time</td>
<td>Little or no procedures set for routine tasks and transitions with not efficient use of time</td>
<td>Inconsistent and minimal procedures with limited time efficiency</td>
<td>Appropriate procedures for effective use of instructional time</td>
<td>Consistently establishes clear and appropriate procedures and maximizes instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for Academic and Social Behavior</td>
<td>Developing and maintaining clear and appropriate expectations for academic and social behavior</td>
<td>Inappropriate or no expectations have been established</td>
<td>Ambiguous or inconsistent expectations have been established</td>
<td>Appropriate expectations have been established</td>
<td>Consistently clear and accurate expectations have been established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Climate for Learning</td>
<td>Creating and maintaining a positive climate appropriate for learning all students</td>
<td>Creates a climate inappropriate for learning</td>
<td>Sometimes creates appropriate climate for learning for some students</td>
<td>Creates and maintains a positive climate appropriate for learning for most students</td>
<td>Consistently creates and maintains a positive climate highly appropriate for learning for all students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSTP: Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning

The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction and learning, as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies and Student Activities</td>
<td>Using relevant and developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and student activities according to purpose or content</td>
<td>Uses developmentally inappropriate or no instructional strategies and student activities with little or no alignment with purpose or content</td>
<td>Uses ambiguously or inconsistently instructional strategies and student activities partially aligned to lesson purpose and content</td>
<td>Uses developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and student activities aligned with lesson purpose and content</td>
<td>Consistently uses relevant and developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and student activities aligned with lesson purpose and content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for Students with Special Needs or Abilities</td>
<td>Making relevant or appropriate plans for students who have special needs or abilities</td>
<td>Makes inappropriate or no plans for students who have special needs or abilities</td>
<td>Makes inconsistent or minimal plans for students who have special needs or abilities</td>
<td>Makes appropriate plans/adaptations for students with special needs and abilities</td>
<td>Consistently makes relevant and appropriate plans/adaptations for students with special needs and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing on Students Backgrounds and Prior Learning in Implementing Instructional Plan</td>
<td>Drawing on detailed and relevant information about students’ backgrounds and prior learning</td>
<td>Uses irrelevant or no information about students’ backgrounds and prior learning for instructional planning</td>
<td>Uses minimal or cursory information about students’ backgrounds and prior learning</td>
<td>Connects relevant aspects of students’ backgrounds and prior learning to appropriate academic learning goals, and assessments</td>
<td>Consistently and appropriately connects relevant aspects for students’ backgrounds and prior learning to aligned and appropriate academic learning goals, instructional plans and assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSTP: Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (Continued)
The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction and learning, as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Practices for English Language Development</td>
<td>Knowing and applying relevant and appropriate instructional practices for ELD</td>
<td>Demonstrates inappropriate or no instructional practices for ELD</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited knowledge and/or ambiguous application of instructional practice for ELD</td>
<td>Demonstrates applied knowledge of appropriate instructional practices for ELD</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates applied knowledge for relevant and appropriate instructional practices for ELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and Equitable Student Participation</td>
<td>Ensuring the active and equitable participation of all students</td>
<td>Shows no or little evidence of using purposeful or appropriate instructional strategies</td>
<td>Using partially appropriate instructional strategies to engage some students in active and equitable participation in student activities that have limited connections to learning goals</td>
<td>Uses appropriate instructional strategies and resources to engage most students in active and equitable participation in student activities that are minimally aligned with student needs and the academic goals</td>
<td>Consistently uses a variety of instructional strategies and resources to engage all students in active and equitable participation that are minimally aligned with student needs, the learning goals and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Strategies to Make Subject Matter Meaningful</td>
<td>Engaging students in analytical and reflective thinking that make subject matter meaningful</td>
<td>Shows little or no evidence of using instructional strategies to engage some students to think analytically and reflectively to make subject matter meaningful</td>
<td>Inconsistently uses partially appropriate instructional strategies to engage some students to think analytically and reflectively to make subject matter meaningful</td>
<td>Uses appropriate instructional strategies (including questioning strategies and wait time) to engage most students to think analytically and reflectively</td>
<td>Consistently uses a variety of appropriate instructional strategies (including questioning strategies and wait time) to engage all students to think analytically and reflectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSTP: Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students

The candidate knows the state adopted content standards for students as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-specific Pedagogical Skills</td>
<td>Demonstrating a detailed and accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state adopted frameworks and academic content standards to all students</td>
<td>Demonstrates an inaccurate or not understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for the teaching of state adopted frameworks and academic content standards that shows no impact on increasing the subject matter understanding of students</td>
<td>Demonstrates a cursory or limited understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state adopted frameworks and academic content standards that has limited impact on subject matter understanding of some students</td>
<td>Demonstrates an accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for the teaching the state adopted frameworks and academic content standards that increased subject matter understanding for most students.</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates a detailed and accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state adopted frameworks and academic content standards that increases subject matter understanding for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating a thorough and accurate understanding of subject matter content and academic content standards and student development</td>
<td>Demonstrating little or no evidence of academic content standards and little or no integration of subject matter understanding with student developmental needs in instructional planning</td>
<td>Demonstrates a partial understanding of academic content standards and partially connects subject matter with a limited understanding of student developmental needs in instructional planning</td>
<td>Demonstrates an accurate understanding of academic content standards and appropriately integrates subject matter understanding with an accurate understanding of student developmental needs in instructional planning</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates a clear and detailed understanding of academic content standards and appropriately integrates subject matter understanding with an accurate understanding of student development needs in instructional planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CSTP: Assessing Student Learning**

The candidate uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments aligned with Academic Learning Goals, Content Standards, Student Needs</td>
<td>Using appropriate assessments (entry/diagnostic, formative and summative) aligned with academic learning goals, state adopted content standards, student backgrounds, needs, interests, and learning styles</td>
<td>Shows little or no evidence in using appropriate assessments aligned with academic learning goals, state adopted content standards or student needs</td>
<td>Inconsistently uses somewhat appropriate assessments aligned with academic learning goals and state adopted content standards; partially addresses student needs in choice of assessments</td>
<td>Uses appropriate assessments aligned with academic learning goals, state adopted content standards and student academic needs</td>
<td>Consistently uses appropriate and relevant assessments aligned with academic learning goals, state adopted content standards, student backgrounds, needs, interests, and learning styles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Formative Progress Monitoring and Feedback to Students | Using progress monitoring appropriately at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately and providing detailed and accurate feedback to students (and as appropriate, families or other audiences) | Shows little or no evidence of monitoring student progress toward academic learning goals or giving feedback to students | Inconsistently monitors the progress of students toward academic learning goals and gives cursory feedback to students | Monitors the progress of students toward academic learning goals and gives accurate feedback to students to support their learning | Consistently monitors the progress of students toward academic learning goals, gives timely, detailed and accurate feedback to students to support their learning |
CSTP: Assessing Student Learning (Continued)
The candidate uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:

| Use of Classroom Assessments and Analysis of Student Work for Instructional and Assessment Planning and Adaptations | Analyzing the results of a variety of appropriate formal and informal as well as formative and summative classroom assessments and other sources of data accurately to guide further planning and adaptations of instruction and assessment | Shows little or no evidence of using assessment of student learning to guide further instruction and assessment | Partially uses the results of somewhat relevant assessments of student learning to guide further instruction and assessment in a cursory manner | Uses the results of assessments of student learning accurately to appropriately guide further planning of instruction and assessment | Consistently and accurately uses the results of a variety of relevant assessments of student learning to appropriately guide the need for further planning and adaptations of instruction and assessment |
## CSTP: Developing as a Professional Educator

The candidate demonstrates development as a professional educator as evidenced by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Candidate Proficiency</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations</td>
<td>Modeling moral/ethical standards, honoring policies and procedures of the work environment</td>
<td>Does not demonstrate moral/ethical standards and policies</td>
<td>Inconsistently demonstrates dispositions of Noble Character</td>
<td>Demonstrates most dispositions of Noble Character</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates dispositions of Noble Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Reflection/Application</td>
<td>Reflecting on teaching practice and planning professional development that impacts student learning</td>
<td>Demonstrates little or no evidence of ability to analyze or reflect on teaching and requires explicit direction to establish professional development goals and improvement plans aligned with standards</td>
<td>Demonstrates a partial ability to analyze and reflect on the results of teaching and student learning needing substantial prompting to establish professional development goals and improvement plans aligned with standards</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to analyze and reflect on the results of teaching on student learning with minimal prompting and to appropriately establish professional development goals and plans aligned with the standards</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates the ability to accurately analyze and reflect on teaching on student learning and to appropriately establish and carry out continuous professional improvement goals and plans aligned with the standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Relationships with Colleagues and Supervisors to Improve Professional Practice</td>
<td>Establishing effective, collaborative relationships with colleagues, supervisors, and other school personnel focused on meeting the diverse needs of students</td>
<td>Demonstrates little or no evidence of ability to work with others in the school environment; is not responsive to feedback or coaching to improve teaching and student learning</td>
<td>Inconsistently demonstrates the ability to work with others; may be partially responsive to feedback and coaching to improve teaching and student learning</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to work with others in the school environment; responsive to feedback and coaching to improve teaching and student learning</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates the ability to work with others in the school environment; activity solicits and is responsive to feedback and coaching to improve teaching and student learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the evidence of candidate proficiency aligned with professional standards and elements throughout this student teaching period, the overall performance of this teaching credential candidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students</td>
<td>Does not meet proficiency for beginning teachers on one or more standards and will require additional remediation for licensure</td>
<td>Solidly meets proficiency levels for beginning teachers on all standards</td>
<td>Consistently meets advanced proficiency for beginning teachers on all standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible for Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing as a Professional Educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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