

STANDARDS

FOR FIELD EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Task Force on Field Experience Standards
Edited by Edith Guyton and David Byrd

Association of Teacher Educators
1900 Association Drive, Suite ATE
Reston VA 20191-1502
(703) 620-3110 Fax (703) 620-9530

INSET COVER PAGE

2000 by Association of Teacher Educators
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Approved by the Association of Teacher Educators' Delegate Assembly
February, 1999

Editing by Edith Guyton and David Byrd

ACTUAL TEXT PAGE BEGINNINGS

Table of Contents

Support for the Standards for Field Experiences	1
Context/Culture of Field Experiences	3
Diversity	4
Collaborative Review and Reform	6
Reflection and Analysis	8
Selection, Preparation and Assignment of Campus-Based and School-Based Teacher Educators	10
Assessment in Field Experiences	12
Conclusions	13
Definition of Terms	14
Standards	
I. Field experiences occur in sites characterized by school/campus collaboration where there is a commitment to simultaneous review and reform of the pre-K-12 and teacher education for the purpose of better serving students in the schools	15
II. Field experiences are assessed using a model that addresses realistic goals and objectives and promotes high expectations. Assessment is ongoing and used for program improvement. The model includes input from those involved in field experiences	15
III. The selection, preparation, and assignment of school-based teacher educators is systematic, collaborative, and based on a framework agreed upon by campus-based and school-based educators.....	17
IV. The selection, preparation, and assignment of campus-based teacher educators is systematic, collaborative, and based on a framework agreed upon by campus-based and school-based educators	18
V. The focus of interaction among teacher candidates, campus-based teacher educators, and school-based teacher educators is on the teacher candidate's professional learning focused on the teaching, and learning of children and youth.....	19

VI.	Teacher candidates receive verbal and written feedback on a continuous formative and summative basis regarding progress in demonstrating professional learning in relation to explicitly stated program and course outcomes agreed upon by campus-based and school-based educators	20
VII.	Teacher candidates, school-based teacher educators, and campus-based teacher educators interact on a regular basis about issues, best practice, and research related to schooling. Teaching and learning through frequent on-site observations and conferences, cross-site interactions, communication networks which link school, campus, and home locations.	21
VIII.	Field experiences incorporate opportunities for ongoing reflection on and analysis of teaching and learning, conditions of schooling, and student development in light of teacher education program goals agreed upon by campus-based and school-based educators.....	22
IX.	Field experiences occur in a context and in a sequence consistent with the goals and mission of the teacher education program.....	23
X.	Field experiences occur in contexts that welcome teacher candidates with a warm, supportive environment	24
XI.	Field experiences occur with diverse student populations and in diverse settings.....	25
XII.	Field experience programs receive adequate resources including financial support for the administration and implementation of quality field experiences	26
	References	27

MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE ON FIELD EXPERIENCE STANDARDS

Appointed by Peggy Ishler (1995)

Edith Guyton, chair Marlene Bachman Sharon Brennan Cheryl Didham Manina Dunn Ann Gayles-Felton Robbie Johnson John McIntyre Paul Paese Joanne Simmons Marcia Swiatek Terri Wenzlaff Peggy Witliff	David Byrd, co-chair Eugene Bales Angela Case Molly Drake Delores Wolfe Eicher John Hicks Roger Kueter Gloria Slick Hema Remanathan Laura Strachowski Gwendolyn Trotter Jeanne Williams
---	--

The Task Force Field Experiences Standards was appointed in 1995 by Peggy Ishler, then president-elect of the Association of Teacher Educators. This group met six times over the last three years. The group developed categories for standards, then explored the literature and developed standards and support for the standards. One draft of the standards was presented at an open hearing at the ATE summer conference in Las Vegas. A subsequent draft was sent to organizations (e.g., AACTE and NCATE) and individuals (e.g., a random sample of the National Field Directors Forum) for feedback. The standards were approved in draft form by the Association of Teacher Educators Delegate Assembly, 1998. Open hearings were held at the 1998 annual meeting and at the 1998 Minneapolis summer conference. State ATE presidents were sent the standards and asked to have open hearings at state meetings. A new draft set of standards was developed based on input from these meetings and from people who responded to the request for feedback. The standards were approved by the ATE Delegate Assembly in February, 1999, with a few minor modifications. An open hearing was held after approval regarding impact and dissemination. Ongoing work of the task force includes dissemination and use of the standards.

SUPPORT FOR THE STANDARDS FOR FIELD EXPERIENCES

INTRODUCTION

FIELD EXPERIENCES have been considered the most important and powerful component of teacher education programs (McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996). Most teacher education programs have incorporated more field experiences into their programs and have increased the number and variety of sites in which students are placed (Black & Ammon, 1991; Garibaldi, 1992). School context, especially the school based supervisor, has a significant impact on teacher development; McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx (1996) assert that “the placement of the prospective teacher for both early field experiences is a critical stage in teacher preparation” (p. 173).

John Dewey (1904) spoke of “miseducative” practices and believed that practice should be accompanied by reflection on the effects of practice. Many teacher education programs have the goal of preparing reflective teachers and espouse field experiences which give opportunities for analysis of and reflection on teaching (Zeichner, 1982).

Although it is clear that field experiences have a profound effect on teacher development, it is not clear that the impact always is positive. McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx (1996) concluded that

Despite the overwhelming positive feeling about the efficacy of field experiences, there does not exist enough data to determine that extending field experiences, whether at the early field experience or student teaching stage, will develop more effective, thoughtful teachers than those prepared in shorter field experience programs. Although there remains a great need for additional research in this area it appears that what occurs during the field experience is more important than the length of the experience (p. 176).

A nation-wide study of teacher education programs revealed that often little connection is made between courses and field experiences and that faculty and school based personnel

often do not connect field experiences to particular goals (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990). McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx (1996) do report that there is a trend towards more thematic programs, but research does not support that field experience activities are well connected to the themes, particularly to themes of reflection and inquiry (Howey, 1986; Howey & Zimpher, 1989; Zeichner & Liston, 1987; Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1982). Some evidence indicates that the school context of field experiences is not always a positive influence on student teacher development (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Adequate attention is not always paid to the impact of the choices made in selecting student teaching placements (Zeichner, 1986), although there is a trend toward more careful selection and more intense involvement of school based personnel.

McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx (1996) conclude from their extensive review of the literature on field experiences that (a) increased practice without reflection and analysis does not lead to professional growth; (b) the context of field placements is very influential on professional development; and (C) evaluation of field experiences should reflect the complex world of teaching.

The importance of field experiences is not disputed among educators. How field experiences are conducted, though, varies greatly from teacher education program to teacher education program. Some variability is desirable in order for programs to be able to respond to their unique circumstances, but some of the differences reflect variations in the quality of programs. Roth (1996) identifies setting standards as one way to deal with quality preparation of teachers, to ensure a minimum level of program quality. The purpose of standards is to create significant change. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education has developed and implemented rigorous standards for teacher education programs (NCATE, 1995). These standards address field experiences in Category 1, Design of Professional Education, section H, Quality of Field Experiences:

The unit ensures that field experiences are consistent with the conceptual framework(s), are well planned and sequenced, and are of high quality.

Indicators:

- 1H1 The unit selects field experiences, including student teaching and internships, to provide candidates with opportunities to:

relate principles and theories from the conceptual framework(s) to actual classrooms and schools;
 create meaningful learning experiences for all students;
 study and practice in a variety of communities, with students of different ages, and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

1H2 Field experiences encourage reflection by candidates and include feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

1H3 Student teaching and internship experiences are sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing (minimum of 10 weeks full time student teaching) (NCATE, 1995, pp. 19-20).

The standards developed by the Association of Teacher Educators are intended to correspond with, complement, and extend the NCATE standards.

CONTEXT/CULTURE OF FIELD EXPERIENCES

A national study by Goodlad (1990) found that many teacher education programs had no influence over the placement of their student teachers and that convenience rather than a quality experience tied to teacher education goals was the major criterion for placement. Other studies suggest that haphazard placements can undermine program goals. For example, Winitsky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe (1992) found that when student teachers used a constructivist approach to teaching, as taught in the teacher education program, cooperating teachers intervened and made students conform to more didactic methods used by the teachers.

The context of field experiences has been posited to have a strong influence on teacher socialization (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Zeichner, 1990). Hoy and Feldman (1987) averred that school context had two constructs: (a) affective context which is the ambience of the school created by such things as teacher morale and (b) objective context which is the socio-economic status of the school. Zeichner (1982) found that the following factors influenced the development of teachers' perspectives: teacher-pupil ratio, material resources, authority relations, school values and ideals, and collegial influence. Kagan (1992) reviewed current research on the role of context in teacher socialization. She reported four contextual factors affecting growth and success: the teaching assignment (the nature of the content and pupils to be taught); colleagues' willingness to provide support; parental relationships; and degree of autonomy and leadership afforded teachers. Guyton and Wesche (1996) studied the contexts of field experiences and found that (a) placing preservice teachers in schools with good morale, pleasant surroundings, a compatible and welcoming cooperating teacher who is a good role model may be just as important as pupils' backgrounds in determining success in full time field experiences, and (b) students whose attitudes are consistent with teacher education program experience enhanced teaching performance.

DIVERSITY

A generally accepted and understood goal for teacher education is the development of teachers capable of working with diverse student populations. The primary method for achieving the goal is placing students in field experiences in schools with diverse populations. Diversity sometimes is defined broadly, but its most typical application is in terms of racial/ethnic/economic differences. America's school children are becoming more ethnically and culturally diverse. This is particularly evident in the largest urban school systems across the country, where ethnic students are a majority of the school-age population. This increase in diversity is accompanied by rising numbers of poor children, especially in inner city schools. These student demographic trends are in stark contrast to the demographic profile of the American teaching force. Over 86 percent of American teachers are European Americans, mostly from the middle class, suburban communities surrounding the city. The sociocultural gap between teachers and students often has a negative effect on student learning and achievement. Since it is not likely that these demographic trends will be reversed in the foreseeable future, it is imperative that teacher education institutions begin to address them in their programs. In urban settings, teachers

deal with the complexities of teaching children beset by poverty, deal with teaching children whose social class and/or ethnicity often is not that of the teacher; deal with bureaucratic inflexibility and social isolation. The numbers of teachers of color are diminishing while the numbers of students of color are rising (AACTE, 1987; Fuller, 1992; Graham, 1987; King, 1993; Tewell & Tribowitz 1987). Reasons for the shortage are related to finances, attitudes toward teaching, prestige, other career opportunities, competency tests, and integration (Tewel & Tribowitz, 1987; Graham, 1987; King, 1993), and solutions focus on recruitment (AACTE, 1987; Bainer, 1990; Henninger, 1989). Increasingly, though, it has become accepted that the majority white teaching force needs opportunities to learn how to teach diverse students.

McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx (1996) summarize the findings from research on the impact of teacher education programs on preservice teachers.

From these findings, three conclusions can be drawn.

First, preservice teachers do not enter teacher education programs with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to work successfully with a diverse population of students. Second, although students can be educated to have greater awareness and understanding of issues regarding multicultural education, they do not necessarily practice what they have learned. Third, preservice students

need to be placed in schools where they have the opportunity

to work with a diverse student body. Furthermore, they need to be encouraged and supported in their analysis of decisions they and others make as teachers and the effects those decisions have on students (p. 183).

Weiner (1993) emphasized the importance of role models in learning to teach in urban schools. Cochran-Smith (1991) insisted that urban teachers need to learn to "teach against the grain."

...teaching against the grain is deeply embedded in the culture and history of teaching at individual schools and

in the biographies of particular teachers and their individual or collaborative efforts to alter curricula, raise questions about common practices, and resist inappropriate decisions. These relationships can only be explored in the company of experienced teachers who are themselves engaged in complex, situation-specific, and sometimes losing struggles to work against the grain (p. 280).

More general arguments also are posited for multiple field experiences. One argument is that increasing the number and variety of placements can dilute any negative influence of any one context (Garibaldi, 1992). Zimpher (1990) claimed that a single field experience placement limits the student's ability to become reflective and restricts learning about school communities. Others, though, have argued that reflection is facilitated by more long term placements (Schon, 1987)

COLLABORATIVE REVIEW AND REFORM

Definitions of collaboration suggest that joint work between two kinds of organizations can produce cooperation, but collaboration requires each to stretch to meet the other (Darling-Hammond, 1994). Kanter (1984) asserts that collaboration is essential for innovation--"...to produce innovation, more complexity is essential; more relationships, more sources of information, more angles on the problem, more ways to pull in human and material resources, more freedom to walk around and across the organization (p. 148)."

Garland and Shippy (1995) found that traditionally, teacher education faculty have worked with teachers and administrators in public schools to provide a variety of clinical experiences for preservice students. These arrangements have been cooperative rather than collaborative, because in most instances they were programs initiated and directed by personnel from the college or university. Collaborative arrangements, however, are substantially different. They are viewed as (a) being true partnerships between colleges or universities and public schools; (b) involving shared decision-making, and in doing so, creating new roles, relationships, and responsibilities for all participants; and (C) focusing on outcomes that are intended to benefit the personnel and the programs at both institutions. The success of collaborative efforts rests on a variety of factors. Bennett, Ishler, and

O'Loughlin (1992) suggested that the following conditions can facilitate effective collaboration.

1. Promotive interdependence. Teams include both college/university and school faculty who will work in each other's classrooms.
2. Balanced exchange of valued commodities. College/university and school faculty share their expertise, experience, and knowledge.
3. Shared decision-making. An advisory board composed of classroom teacher, college faculty, and school and college/university administrators makes decisions.
4. Adaptations to inherent barriers. Adaptations are made to overcome problems related to time, absence of rewards, lack of resources, absence of specialized expertise, and conflicting schedules.
5. Enabling support structure. Key administrators who work with the advisory board who provide encouragement and recognition provide a support framework.

The key players in the field experience are the teacher candidate, the school-based teacher educator, and the campus-based teacher educator. This threesome is often referred to as the triad. A number of studies conducted in the United States, Great Britain, and Australia have indicated that the primary roles and functions of each member of the field experiences triad are typically implicitly rather than explicitly stated and are likely to be unclear (Beswick, Harmon, Elsworth, Fallon, & Woock, 1980; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Boothroyd, 1979; Cope, 1973; Tittle, 1974; Yates, 1981; Yee, 1967). Each member may, therefore, develop role conceptualizations and expectations that do not align with the expectations of other members of the triad.

Research has also shown this lack of clarity may give rise to a number of interpersonal problems or tensions within the triad, including the emergence of competitive

versus cooperative attitudes, the inclination to become increasingly more negative toward one another, and the tendency to blame each other when problems arise (Tittle, 1974; Yee, 1967). Lack of clearly agreed upon and delineated goals, roles, and responsibilities not only hampers teacher education programs in general but also more specifically hinders the effectiveness of the triad as a supportive alliance to advance the growth and development of the teacher candidate (McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx, 1996, p. 179).

True collaboration takes time. Collaborative ventures never proceed as smoothly and quickly as those undertaken by one or two individuals do. It takes time to build trust and working relationships, particularly when forming partnerships among institutions with different missions and cultures. There are inevitable differences, disagreements and conflicts that must be resolved within this complex relationship. Both the public school and higher education institutions may look upon the partnership as an addition to an already heavy work-load; consequently collaboration should ultimately be a part of the job rather than an addition to it (Sandholtz, 1996). Participants in the field experiences triad must take steps to collaboratively ensure that role expectations are made explicit and are clearly articulated among all three members of the triad. True collaboration also requires that the public schools share with higher education institutions the responsibility for the field-based portions of teacher education and incorporate the role of teacher education into the school structure.

REFLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Much research shows that interventions must affect teacher cognitions (i.e., teachers' thinking about their own acts of teaching) in order to affect teacher performance. Research also shows strong links between teachers' cognitions and student outcomes (higher order skills). Teacher education needs to move preservice teachers to higher conceptual levels, more complex thinking about teaching and influence teachers to make connections between their lives in classrooms and what is being learned.

There also is a growing acceptance of the belief that teaching performance is a function of complex intellectual processes. Sprinthall, Reiman and Thies-Sprinthall (1996) summarized findings from a research program/study of teacher education (Griffin, 1986). "Effective teacher education programs are based on a conception of teacher growth and development; acknowledge the complexities of classroom, school, and community; are grounded in a substantial and verifiable knowledge base; and are sensitive to the ways

teachers think, feel, and make meanings from their experiences” (p. 687). The authors then advocate a model for cognitive-developmental instruction that includes: role taking, taking on a more complex role; reflection (journals, demonstrations, case studies for dialogue on the meaning of experience); balance of role taking and reflection that forms an interactive praxis; continuity; and a balance between support and challenge (p. 692). They advocate working on the development of programs that promote more efficient cognitive problem solving by teachers and on developing authentic assessments to judge the effectiveness of the interventions (p. 673).

Teachers’ thought processes have been a subject for study for some time (Clark & Peterson, 1986). Many studies have shown some connection between teacher cognition and student outcomes. Miller (1981) found that people functioning at higher conceptual levels exhibited behaviors such as reduction in prejudice, greater empathic communication, a greater focus on internal control, more thoughtful decision making, more flexible teaching methods, more autonomy and interdependence, and superior communication and information processing. McKibbin and Joyce (1981) found a direct relationship between level of cognitive development and employment of innovative teaching methods learned in workshops. Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall (1996), in a review of the literature, found strong support for the relationship between cognitive developmental level and more competent, effective, and efficient teachers (p. 677). Fennema, Franke, Carpenter and Carey (1993) conducted a case study which showed a strong link between teacher conceptual complexity and student higher-order thinking and problem solving. Peterson, Fennema, Carpenter and Loef (1989) found that teachers at higher levels of cognitive complexity employed increased higher order teaching skills such as problem posing, active listening, ongoing assessment, and continuous adaptation. Knapp and Peterson (1991) found teachers at higher cognitive levels were more likely to use new and innovative teaching techniques. Kennedy (1991) also reported a connection between teachers’ level of cognitive processing and student outcomes. Costa and Garmston (1994) summarized a number of studies which found a relationship between cognitive complexity of teachers and student achievement (Glickman, 1985; Harvey, 1967; Hunt, 1980; McNerney & Carrier, 1981; Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983; Witherall & Erickson, 1978). All of these studies support the need for an emphasis on developing teachers’ cognitive development.

The literature also indicates that cognitive development is not automatic. King and Kitchener (1994) found that adults exhibit stage and sequence growth in reflective judgment with the highest stage being similar to Dewey’s conception of scientific problem solving.

This growth does not happen as a result of age or experience; it requires a stimulating and supportive environment along with appropriate interaction. A study (NCRTE, 1991) also found that experience is not necessarily an indicator of growth. There were no significant differences between novice and experienced teachers in elementary schools in attitudes, conceptual skills, and classroom practice. These studies strongly suggest that intervention is needed to promote teachers' cognitive growth. As Dewey (1938) posited, experience at times can be miseducative. There must be ways of drawing meaning from experience. Much theoretical support exists for developing the reflective ability of teachers (Schon, 1983, 1987; Reiman & Parramore, 1993; Sprinthall, Reiman, & Thies-Sprinthall, 1993). Ross (1988) asserted that teacher education programs must contribute to teacher reflectivity, and Nolan and Huber (1989) identified one of the goals of supervision as engaging teachers in reflection on practice. Johnson (1996) also advocates "cognitive apprenticeship" models of teacher education.

Coaching (by peers and experts) is a procedure that shows much promise for affecting teachers' cognitions and for engaging them in reflection. Joyce and Showers' (1989) meta-analysis of more than 200 studies found a large effect size for coaching on the transfer of new skills and models of teaching learned in professional development. Sparks (1986) found that peer coaching after professional development produced significant change in teacher behavior. Several studies (Anderson and Roit, 1993; Buttery, 1988; Phillips & Glickman, 1991) reported that developmentally based peer coaching had a positive effect on teachers' conceptual levels. Costa and Garmston (1994) summarized several studies which showed positive effects of cognitive coaching on teachers' cognitive development (Edwards, 1982; Foster, 1989; Garmston & Hyerle, 1988; Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993; Lipton, 1993).

SELECTION, PREPARATION AND ASSIGNMENT OF CAMPUS-BASED AND SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER EDUCATORS

Specific guidance for teacher candidates is valuable (Odell, 1986; Darling-Hammond, 1995). Educators have concluded that this guidance should come from school-based and campus-based teacher educators. The school-based teacher educators should be specially prepared, trained in supervision, aware of the goals and objectives of the field experience, and have holistic knowledge about the teacher education program in which they are participating (Applegate, 1982; Faire, 1994; Killian & McIntyre, 1987). They also should be professional role models who are able to articulate their concepts of the teaching

profession and who are active in professional organizations (Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Hauwiler, Abel, Ausel, & Sparapani, 1988-89) Good school-based teacher educators are mentors who provide opportunities for the teacher candidate to reflect upon and understand teaching (Lewis, 1993; Rekkas, 1995) and coaches who provide regular feedback (Farris, Henninger, & Bischoff, 1991; Joyce, Showers, & Rolheiser-Bennet, 1987; McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996).

Campus-based teacher educators should be involved in the field experience and should be associated with the university and its programs beyond the supervision of the particular field experience (Enz, Kimerer, & Freeman, 1996; Goodlad, 1990). They, also, should be specially prepared for the role (Faire, 1994). The campus-based teacher educator is the liaison between campus and school and communicates the goals and objectives of the program to school personnel and to the teacher candidate when necessary (Goodlad, 1990; Johnson, 1988). It is desirable that the campus-based educator have associations with the school beyond the single field experience, participates in school activities, provides professional development opportunities for school-based teacher educators, and plans and implements field experiences in collaboration with school-based educators (Applegate & Lasley, 1986; Bischoff, 1988). The campus-based teacher educator is ultimately responsible for evaluating the teacher candidate and should provide regular feedback to the teacher candidate, involve the school-based teacher educator, facilitate formative and summative evaluations, and provide holistic evaluation (Williams, et al., 1997).

Becher and Ade (1982) found that being a good role model, in and of itself, is not sufficient for school-based teacher educators to influence positively the behaviors of teacher candidates, that it is important that they give feedback and allow opportunities for innovation. Many school-based educators are unable or unwilling to articulate good teaching practices (Wright, Silvern, & Burkhalter, 1982). Several studies found that found that teachers with specific training are better at giving feedback to teacher candidates (Killian and McIntyre, 1986); improved their communication with teacher candidates (Hauwiler, Abel, Ausel, and Sparapani, 1988-89); and made positive changes in teachers' cognitive growth, active listening, use of different teaching models, and self-direction (Thies-Sprinhall, 1984; 1986). Joyce and Showers (1980) analyzed over 200 studies and concluded that instruction, demonstration, and coaching were all essential elements of supervision, and their later research (Joyce & Showers, 1995) confirmed the importance of coaching skills for supervisors. These findings suggest that school-based educators need to be educated to have the maximum influence on teacher candidates' teaching.

The theories of Vygotsky (1978) also support education for school-based and campus-based teacher educators. Vygotsky believes growth is enhanced by interaction with a more experienced person in one's zone of proximate development, the place at which one can perform adequately with the help of the more experienced person. Supervisors of teacher candidates can benefit from knowing this theory and learning what kinds of social interaction and dialogue will promote teacher growth.

ASSESSMENT IN FIELD EXPERIENCES

Program feedback and evaluation are important aspects of field experiences programs. Assessing teacher candidates in terms of goals of the program can be a validation device for the program, as well as a source of information for program improvement.

McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx (1996) state that "The evaluations of students in practicum experiences are based on a limited knowledge base Y" (p. 186). They advocate models of evaluation that incorporate demonstration of competencies (more quantitative, low inference measures of teaching) as well as more naturalistic, holistic approaches (more qualitative, high inference measures of teaching). If assessment is authentic, then it is useful not only in providing information to preservice teachers about their teaching but also is useful in assessing if the teacher education program is meeting its goals. Tellez (1996) states that "Assessments are authentic to the degree to which they are meaningful to and helpful for teachers in the exploration of their practices" (p. 707). The purpose of assessment is teacher growth and development. Measuring teachers' development within a framework of teacher education program goals is the best way to assess field experience programs. And obviously if the goals include such outcomes as reflective teaching, then more traditional, quantitative, low inference models of assessment will not yield good information for the program. Support for observations in combination with written feedback and conferences is abundant (Stodolsky, 1990; Wilkins-Cantor, 1996; Wood, 1991). Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1993) provide a strong rationale for conducting conferences which address longitudinal issues related to instructional decisions and teaching and promote self-reflection. Portfolios allow teacher candidates to show actions and decisions made over time by compiling artifacts of their work. Candidates can document their work and analyze their decision-making processes. The value of portfolios

for teacher growth is well-documented (Varvus & Collins, 1991). INTASC's Performance Assessment Development Project (1996) offers criteria for evaluating portfolios. Many institutions have portfolio requirements in their teacher education programs.

CONCLUSIONS

- ☐ Field experiences are part of a complex developmental process of becoming a teacher. Field experiences should recognize the developmental level(s) of the teacher candidates engaged in them.
- ☐ More field experiences are not the answer. Better planned and more deliberative field experiences based on program goals are more likely to influence teacher candidates in positive ways.
- ☐ Field experience programs are the responsibility of institutions of higher education and of schools and should be collaboratively developed and implemented.
- ☐ Field experience programs must attend to helping teacher candidates be able to teach diverse children in diverse settings.
- ☐ Reflection on and analysis of teaching and learning is an essential component of learning to teach.
- ☐ Well qualified school based and campus based teacher educators who work with teacher candidates are essential to appropriate development of teacher candidates.
- ☐ Contexts for field experiences should be carefully chosen.
- ☐ Good field experience programs are highly related to the teacher education program goals and standards.
- ☐ Feedback and assessment are essential characteristics of good field experience programs.
- ☐ Good communication among all parties involved in field experiences is essential.

Definition of Terms

Campus-Based Teacher Educator -- the person from the college/ university who works with a field experience student on campus and in the schools

Collaboration -- partnerships between schools and colleges/ universities which include shared decision making and mutual benefits and which are focused on simultaneous reform of schools and higher education. This term denotes relationships that are deeper than cooperative ones in which schools simply participate in the teacher education program designed by higher education institutions.

Context -- the social, political, economic, morale conditions prevalent in a classroom, school, school system

Diverse Student Populations -- populations of students representing ethnic, racial, socioeconomic, ability, and physical differences

Field Experiences -- denotes the entire range of school experiences, includes early field experiences to student teaching

Program outcome -- what should happen in a teacher education program if the standard is achieved

Performance outcome -- what the teacher candidate should know and be able to do if the standard is achieved

School-Based Teacher Educator -- the teacher with whom a field experience student is working

Teacher candidate - - a person engaged in a field experience who is being prepared to be a teacher

STANDARDS FOR FIELD EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

- I. FIELD EXPERIENCES OCCUR IN SITES CHARACTERIZED BY SCHOOL/CAMPUS COLLABORATION WHERE THERE IS A COMMITMENT TO SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW AND REFORM OF PRE-K-12 AND TEACHER EDUCATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF BETTER SERVING STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOLS.**

Indicators:

- ☐ The goals and mission of the teacher education program and the goals and processes of the field experiences are developed and agreed upon collaboratively by campus based and school based teacher educators and administrators.

- II. FIELD EXPERIENCES ARE ASSESSED USING A MODEL THAT ADDRESSES REALISTIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES AND PROMOTES HIGH EXPECTATIONS. ASSESSMENT IS ONGOING AND USED FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT. THE MODEL INCLUDES INPUT FROM THOSE INVOLVED IN FIELD EXPERIENCES REGARDING AREAS SUCH AS:**

CONTEXT/SETTING
PLACEMENT PROCESS
COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS/FOSTERING
PROFESSIONALISM
SUPERVISORY ROLES
PROGRAM GOALS
OUTCOMES FOR TEACHER CANDIDATES
BENEFITS TO P-12 STUDENTS
RESOURCES
REWARDS AND ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL
POLICIES/PRACTICES

Indicators:

- ☐ Campus and school-based teacher educators work together in developing the field experiences program.
- ☐ Collaboration takes place among school and campus administrators, teacher education faculty, and teachers.
- ☐ The field experiences program is based on knowledge from research, theory and practice.
- ☐ Decisions concerning the field experiences program are made collaboratively.
- ☐ Roles and functions of all parties in the field experiences are clear.
- ☐ Field experiences are designed collaboratively to enhance the education of P-12 students, and benefits to the students are made clear to all stakeholders in the process, including parents.
- ☐ Both campus and school-based teacher educators feel ownership of the field experiences program and work on issues and problems together.
- ☐ Procedures for communication are well articulated, ongoing and consistent.
- ☐ Campus-based teacher educators collaboratively develop and review program evaluations.
- ☐ Regular communication occurs frequently among constituent groups.
- ☐ The program has a procedure for identifying problems which involves campus and school-based teacher educators in addressing the problems.
- ☐ The program conducts collaborative research and applies it to program improvement.

Program Outcomes:

- ☐ Program assessment consistently informs practice.
- ☐ Field experiences programs reflect the best knowledge from research, theory, and practice.
- ☐ Campus and school-based teacher educators standards and expectations for field experiences are consistent for all parties.

III. THE SELECTION, PREPARATION, AND ASSIGNMENT OF SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER EDUCATORS IS SYSTEMATIC, COLLABORATIVE, AND BASED ON A FRAMEWORK AGREED UPON BY CAMPUS-BASED AND SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATORS.

Indicators:

- ☐ Each teacher candidate works under the direct guidance of a school-based teacher educator who is able to serve as professional role model consistent with program goals, mentor, and coach.
- ☐ School-based teacher educators are selected based on experience, quality of instruction, and other relevant criteria developed by campus based and school based educators.
- ☐ School based teacher educators are collaboratively chosen by campus based educators and school administrators.
- ☐ Program objectives and assessment are well articulated.
- ☐ School-based teacher educators are provided written guidelines and teacher development opportunities.

Program Outcome:

- ☐ School-based teacher educators are well qualified to work with teacher candidates in field experiences.

IV. THE SELECTION, PREPARATION AND ASSIGNMENT OF CAMPUS-BASED TEACHER EDUCATORS IS SYSTEMATIC, COLLABORATIVE, AND BASED ON A FRAMEWORK AGREED UPON BY CAMPUS-BASED AND SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATORS

Indicators:

- ☐ Each teacher candidate interacts in a variety of ways with a prepared campus-based educator who is able to serve as a liaison, collaborator, and clinical instructor in the field experience program.

Indicators:

- ☐ Campus-based educators are well-versed in knowledge and skills regarding teacher development, supervision, conferencing, and assessment.
- ☐ The teacher education program provides guidelines, deadlines, and literature to describe the campus-based educator's job/role.
- ☐ School based educators are involved in selection of campus based educators.
- ☐ Campus-based teacher educators are involved in teacher education program development and implementation.
- ☐ The teacher education program has procedures for facilitating communication, meetings, workshops, and assistance with problems.

Program Outcome:

- ☐ Campus-based teacher educators are well qualified to work with teacher candidates in field experiences.

V. THE FOCUS OF INTERACTION AMONG TEACHER CANDIDATES, CAMPUS-BASED TEACHER EDUCATORS, AND SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER EDUCATORS IS ON THE TEACHER CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOCUSED ON THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH. INTERACTION CENTERS AROUND SPECIFIED AREAS FEATURED IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AND COURSE OUTCOMES WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE HIGH STANDARDS DEVELOPED BY THE PROGRAM AND/OR CURRENT NATIONAL STANDARDS (SUCH AS THE INTERSTATE NEW TEACHER AND SUPPORT CONSORTIUM STANDARDS).

Indicators:

- ☐ All field experience participants demonstrate pedagogical and content knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are congruent with teacher education program outcomes.
- ☐ Clinical learning interaction is aligned with specific teacher education program outcomes.
- ☐ The focus of demonstrations of professional learning match program goals.
- ☐ Field experiences are aligned to meet programmatic and/or national standards.

Program Outcome:

- ☐ The teacher candidate experiences clinical learning interaction focused on demonstrations of professional growth in relation to specific teacher education program outcomes.

Performance Outcomes:

- ☐ The teacher candidate supports practice with theory and research.
- ☐ The teacher candidate reflects on teaching.

- ☐ The teacher candidate makes sound educational decisions.
- ☐ The teacher candidate articulates the connections and disconnections between the teacher education program outcomes and practices in the field.
- ☐ The teacher candidate demonstrates increased professional learning in areas outlined above.

VI. TEACHER CANDIDATES RECEIVE VERBAL AND WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON A CONTINUOUS FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE BASIS REGARDING PROGRESS IN DEMONSTRATING PROFESSIONAL LEARNING IN RELATION TO EXPLICITLY STATED PROGRAM AND COURSE OUTCOMES AGREED UPON BY CAMPUS-BASED AND SCHOOL BASED-EDUCATORS.

Indicators:

- ☐ The program provides resources for giving feedback to teacher candidates.
- ☐ The program has systematic procedures for assessing the readiness of teacher candidates to progress in the program and to enter the teaching profession.
- ☐ The experience is designed with regularly scheduled times for conferences among the teacher candidate, school-based teacher educator, and campus-based teacher educator.
- ☐ Performance-based feedback and assessment procedures incorporate multiple procedures such as professional portfolios, self-assessment, and peer-assessment.
- ☐ Teacher candidates are aware of the field experience expectations.
- ☐ Teacher candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and

attitudes in each field experience needed to be successful at the next level of field experiences and to be a competent teacher.

Program Outcomes:

- ☐ Teacher candidates are provided feedback for improving practice.
- ☐ Assessment and decisions about progression in the teacher education program and entry to the profession are shared functions between the campus and school-based teacher educators.

Performance Outcomes:

- ☐ Teacher candidates use feedback on practice to make changes to increase student learning.
- ☐ Teacher candidates assess their own teaching on a regular basis.

VII. TEACHER CANDIDATES, SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER EDUCATORS, AND CAMPUS-BASED TEACHER EDUCATORS INTERACT ON A REGULAR BASIS ABOUT ISSUES, BEST PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH RELATED TO SCHOOLING, TEACHING AND LEARNING THROUGH FREQUENT ON SITE OBSERVATIONS AND CONFERENCES, CROSS-SITE INTERACTIONS, AND USE OF INTERACTIVE, ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION NETWORKS WHICH LINK SCHOOL, CAMPUS, AND HOME LOCATIONS.

Indicators:

- ☐ Teacher candidates, school-based teacher educators, and campus-based teacher educators communicate with each other in some way at least once a week.
- ☐ Quality interaction among teacher candidates, school-based teacher educators and campus-based teacher educators facilitates a professional learning community.

Program Outcomes:

- ☐ Teacher candidates and school-based and campus-based teacher educators experience satisfaction with their interactions.
- ☐ Teacher candidates are part of an ongoing dialogue about teaching focused on important aspects of teaching and learning.
- ☐ Problems are resolved in a timely manner.
- ☐ Communication problems decrease.

Performance Outcomes:

- ☐ Teacher candidates demonstrate increased self-confidence and skills in communication.
- ☐ Teacher candidates understand that teaching is complex and demonstrate an ability to reflect on educational issues and apply good decision making skills.

VIII. FIELD EXPERIENCES INCORPORATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ONGOING REFLECTION ON AND ANALYSIS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING, CONDITIONS OF SCHOOLING, AND STUDENT DEVELOPMENT IN LIGHT OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM GOALS AGREED UPON BY CAMPUS-BASED AND SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATORS.

Indicators:

- ☐ Teacher candidates routinely are required to reflect on their field experiences.
- ☐ Campus and school-based teacher educators pose critical thinking questions about the nature of teaching, learning, and schooling to teacher candidates.
- ☐ Tools for reflection, such as journals and portfolios, are a part of field experiences.

- ☐ Teacher candidates analyze teaching in terms of why as well as how.

Program Outcomes:

- ☐ Teacher candidates understand teaching as complex.
- ☐ Teacher candidates view teaching as ongoing decision-making rather than a prescriptive activity.
- ☐ Teacher candidates achieve praxis.

Performance Outcomes:

Teacher candidates discuss the complexities of the teaching role in meeting the challenges of the classroom.

Teacher candidates demonstrate an ability to be an effective decision maker using data regarding students, school context, goals, and available knowledge.

IX. FIELD EXPERIENCES OCCUR IN A CONTEXT AND IN A SEQUENCE CONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS AND MISSION OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Indicators:

- ☐ Campus and school-based teacher educators hold compatible views and philosophies about teaching and learning.
- ☐ The content of campus-based education is modeled in school-based field experiences.
- ☐ What is changing in schools is studied in teacher education.
- ☐ The teacher education program has varied field experiences designed to meet varied and sequential goals of the teacher education program.

- ☐ Field experiences are sequential and cumulative and based on models of professional development.
- ☐ The scope and sequence of field experiences is highly related to the developmental stages of the teacher candidates.

Program Outcomes:

- ☐ Field placements meet different goals of the teacher education program.
- ☐ Field experiences are sequenced to meet the developmental needs of teacher candidates.

Performance Outcomes:

- ☐ Teacher candidates relate theory and practice to instructional decision making.

X. FIELD EXPERIENCES OCCUR IN CONTEXTS THAT WELCOME TEACHER CANDIDATES WITH A WARM, SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT.

Indicators:

- ☐ Teacher candidates feel comfortable in the schools in which they are placed.
- ☐ Stakeholders are aware of benefits to P-12 students resulting from having teacher candidates in their classrooms.
- ☐ Administrators, teachers, students, and parents in the school setting want and support teacher candidates in their schools and classrooms.

Program Outcomes:

- ☐ Teacher candidates are able to learn more from field experiences because their personal standing in the school is clear, and they feel welcome.

Performance Outcome:

- ☐ Teacher candidates participate in the life of the school as a member of a learning community.

XI. FIELD EXPERIENCES OCCUR WITH DIVERSE STUDENT POPULATIONS AND IN DIVERSE SETTINGS.

Indicators:

- ☐ Teacher candidates have extended field experiences with diverse school populations including students of different age levels, diverse racial and ethnic groups, diverse socio-economic backgrounds, and diverse special needs.
- ☐ The teacher education program has a systematic way of providing diverse placements for teacher candidates.
- ☐ Teacher candidates have field experiences in schools with diverse administrative, curricular, and structural features.

Program Outcome:

- ☐ Teacher candidates have opportunities to work with different students and in different school structures.

Performance Outcomes:

- ☐ The teacher candidate plans instruction that addresses the needs and interests of diverse students.
- ☐ The teacher education candidate works effectively in a variety of settings with diverse students.

XII. FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS RECEIVE ADEQUATE RESOURCES INCLUDING FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY FIELD EXPERIENCES.

Indicators:

- ☐ Field experiences programs are able to meet the standards above as shown by the indicators above.
- ☐ Administration of field experiences is a school based and a campus based activity and includes teacher educators and/or administrators from both contexts.
- ☐ A person or group of persons is designated and compensated for handling logistical responsibilities of the field experience program including teacher candidate clearance; procurement and placement of teacher candidates in field assignments; development of field experience guidelines, handbooks, etc; arranging seminars and meetings that include large groups of teacher candidates; and developing and implementing assessment and research procedures.
- ☐ School based and campus based teacher educators take responsibility for providing resources.

References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1987).
Minority teachers' recruitment & retention: A public policy.
Washington, DC: Author.
- Applegate, . (1982). The impact of construct system development on
communication and impression formation in persuasive contexts.
Communication Monographs, 49(4), 277-289.
- Applegate, & Lasley, . (1985). Students' expectations for early field
experience. Texas Technical Journal of Education, 12(1), 27-36.
- Bainer. (1990). The relationship between instructional domain and
the content of reflection among preservice teachers. Paper
presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Educational
Research Association, Chicago.
- Becher, R., & Ade, W. (1982). The relationship of field placement
characteristics and students potential field performance abilities
to clinical experience performance rating.
Journal of Teacher Education, 33(2), 24-30.
- Bennett, R. V., Ishler, M. F., & O'Loughlin, M. (1992). Effective
collaboration in teacher education.
Action in Teacher Education, 14(1), 52-56.
- Beswick, D. C., Harmon, G. S., Elsworth, G. R., Fallon, B. J. &
Woock, R. R. (1980). Australian teacher educators and education
policy: A national study of the views and characteristics of academic
staff and practicing teachers who contribute to teacher education.
Melbourne, Australia: University of Melbourne, Center for the
Study of Higher Education.
- Black, A. & Ammon, P. (1992). A developmental-constructivist
approach to teacher education.
Journal of Teacher Education, 43(5), 323-335.
- Bischoff, J.. (1988). The relationship of teacher fitness to teacher
student interaction.
Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7(2), 42-51.
- Boothroyd, W. (1979). Teaching practice supervision: A research
report. British Journal of Teacher Education, 5(3), 243-250.
- Clark, C. And Peterson, P. (1986). Teachers' thought processes.
In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of Research in Teaching, 3rd ed.,
New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing student teaching.
Journal of Teacher Education, 42(2), 104-118.0
- Cope, E. (1973). School experience and student learning. In

- D. E. Loomas (Ed.), *The education of teachers in Britain* (p. 243-261). London: Wiley.
- Costa, A.L. & Garmston, R.J. (1994). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional development schools*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College.
- Dewey, J. (1904). *The relation of theory to practice in education*. In National Society for the Study of Education (Ed.), *The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers*. Third yearbook, Part 1 . Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Enz, B., Kimerer, K., & Freeman, D. (1997). Does the university have an obligation to care? *The Educational Forum*, V.62, 62-73.
- Faire, M. (1994). *Improving the practicum: The professional development needs of lecturers, associate teachers, and student teachers*. Paper presented at the annual conference of Australian Teacher Education Association (24th, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, July 3-6, 1994).
- Farris, P., Henniger, M., & Bischoff, J. (1991). After the wave of reform, the role of early field experiences in elementary teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 13(2), 20-24.
- Fennema, E., Franke, M., Carpenter, T., & Carey, D. (1993). Using children's mathematical Knowledge in instruction. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(3), 555-584.
- Fuller, M. L. (1992). Monocultural teachers & multicultural students: A demographic clash. *Teaching Education*, 4(2), 87-93.
- Garibaldi, A. (1992). Preparing teachers. In M. Dilworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 23-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Garland, C. & Shippy, V. (1995). *Perspectives on the future. Guiding clinical experiences*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Glickman. (1985). The supervisor's challenge: Changing the teacher's work environment. *Educational Leadership*, 42(4), 38-40.
- Goldhammer , Anderson , & Krajewski. (1993). *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Goodlad, J., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (1990). *Places where teachers are taught*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Graham, P. A. (1987). Black teachers: A drastically scarce resource. *Phi Delta Kappa* (April), 598-605.
- Griffin, G. (1986). Clinical teacher education. In J. Hoffman & S. Edwards (Eds.), *Reality and reform in clinical teacher education* (pp.1-24). New York: Random House.
- Grimmett, P. P. & Ratzlaff, H. C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teacher role. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(6), 41-50.
- Guyton, E. & McIntyre, J.D. (1990). Student teaching and field experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (1st ed., pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan.
- Guyton, E. & Wesche, M. (1996). Relationships among school context and student teachers' attitudes and performance. In McIntyre, J.D. & Byrd, D.M., *Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Harvey, O. J. (1967). Conceptual systems and attitude change. In *Attitude, ego involvement, and change* (p. 17). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Hauwiler, J., Abel, F., Ausel, D., & Sparapani, E. (1988-1989). Enhancing the effectiveness of cooperating teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 10(4), 42-46.
- Henninger, M. L. (1989). Recruiting minority students: Issues & options. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(6), 35-39.
- Howey, K. (1986). The next generation of teacher preparation programs. In T. Lasley (Ed.), *The dynamics of change in teacher education* (pp. 161-185). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Howey, K. & Zimpher, N. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hoy, W. K. & Feldman, J. A. (1987). Organizational health: The concept and its measure. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, v. 20, 30-38.
- Hunt, D. E. (1980). Teacher's adaptation: Reading and flexing to students. In *Flexibility in teaching* (Chapter 4). New York: Longman Press.
- Interstate New teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1996). *Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of State School Officers.
- Johnson, K. E. (1996). The vision versus the reality: The tensions of

- the TESOL practicum. In D. Freeman and J. C. Richards (eds.) *Teachers learning in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, P. T. (1988). Improving the curriculum for limited English speaking students at Sierra Junior High. *NAASP Bulletin*, v.72, 95-100.
- Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. *Educational Leadership*, 37(5), 379-385.
- Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. (1995). *Student achievement through staff development*. 2nd ed. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, v. 62(2), 129-169.
- Kanter, R.M. (1984). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kennedy, M. (1991). *An agenda for research on teacher learning (technical report)*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Killian, J. & McIntyre, J. (1987). Quality in early field experiences: A product of grade level and cooperating teacher's training. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2(4), 367-376.
- King, S. H. (1993). The limited presence of African American teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(2), 115-150.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgement: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knapp, N., & Peterson, P. (1991, April). What does CGI mean to you? Teachers' ideas of a research-based intervention four years later. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M. & Foxx, S. M. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 171-193). New York: Macmillan.
- McKibbin, M., & Joyce, B. R. (1981). Psychological states. *Theory into Practice*, 19(4), 248-255.
- McNerney, R. F. & Carrier, C. A. (1981). *Teacher development*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Miller, A. (1981). Conceptual matching models and interactional research in education. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(1), 33-84.
- National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (1991). *Final Report*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

- National Council for Accreditation on Teacher Education (NCATE). (1995). Standards, procedures, policies for the accreditation of professional education units. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.
- Nolan, T., & Huber, T. (1989). Nurturing the reflective practitioner through instructional supervision: A review of the literature. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 4(2), 126-145.
- Peterson, P., Fennema, E., Carpenter, T., & Loef, M. (1989). Teachers' pedagogical content beliefs in mathematics. *Cognition & Instruction*, 6(1), 1-40.
- Reiman, A. R., & Paramore, B. M. (1993). Promoting preservice teacher development through extended field experience. In M. O'Hair & S. Odell (Eds.), *Teacher education yearbook I: Diversity and teaching* (pp. 11-121). Fort Worth, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Rekkas, A. J. (1994?). Early field experience: How well are student's expectations met? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 13, 1994).
- Ross, D. (1988). Reflective teaching: Meaning and implication for preservice teacher educators. In H. Waxman, H. J. Freilberg, J. Vaughan, & M. Weil (Eds.), *Images of reflection in teacher education*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Roth, R. (1996). Standards for certification, licensure, and accreditation. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton, (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 242-278). New York: Macmillan.
- Sandholtz, J. H. (1996). A model, not a mold. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on the education of our nation's teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sprinthall, N., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1983). The teacher as an adult learner -- A cognitive developmental view. *Staff Development: 82nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sprinthall, N. A., Reiman, A. J., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1993). Roletaking and reflection: Promoting the conceptual and moral development of teachers. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 5(4), 283-299.
- Sprinthall, N. A., Reiman, A. J., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1996). Teacher professional development. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery and E. Guyton (Eds.). *Handbook of research in teacher education*.

New York: Macmillan.

- Tellez, K. (1996). Authentic assessment. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 704-721). New York: Macmillan.
- Tewell, K. J. & Trubowitz, S. (1987). The minority group teacher: An endangered species. *Urban Education*, 22(3), 355-364.
- Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1984). Promoting the developmental growth of supervising teachers: Theory, research, programs and implication. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(3), 53-60.
- Tittle, C. K. (1974). *Student teaching: Attitudes and research bases for change in school and university*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weiner, C. (1993). *Preparing teachers for urban schools: Lessons from thirty years of school reform*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Williams, D., Ramanathan, H., Smith, D., Cruz, J., & Lipsett, L. (1997). Problems related to participants' roles and programmatic goals in student teaching supervision. *The Midwestern Researcher*, 10(4), 2-10.
- Winitsky, N. Stoddart, T., & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1), 3-18.
- Witherall, C. S. & Erickson, V. L. (1978). Teacher education as adult development. *Theory into Practice*, 17(3), 229-238.
- Wood, G. (1992). Restructuring time, size and governance: Steps to democratic schooling. *Democracy and Education*, 6(3), 3-13.
- Wright, P. J., Silvern, S. B., & Burkhalter, B. B. (1982). An evaluation of teacher input in field-based instruction. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 15(2), 34-37.
- Yates, J. W. (1981). Student teaching in England: Results of a recent survey. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(5), 44-47.
- Yee, A. H. (1967). *The student teaching triad: The relationship of attitudes among student teachers, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers*. Austin: University of Texas, College of Education.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1990). Educational and social commitments in reflective teacher education programs. In: *Proceedings of the National Forum of the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education* (4th, Milwaukee, WI, November 9-11, 1990).
- Zeichner, K. (1986). Social and ethical dimensions of reform in teacher education. In J. Hoffman & S. Edwards (Eds.), *Clinical teacher*

- education (pp. 87-108). New York: Random House.
- Zeichner, K. (1982). Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. *Interchange*, 12(4), 1-21.
- Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 23-48.
- Zeichner, K. & Tabachnik, B. R. (1982). The belief systems of university supervisors in an elementary student teaching program. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 8(1), 35-54.