Success In High-Need Schools Journal

Vol. 9, #1
Issue Introduction

Few issues in teacher education have received more attention in reform efforts of the past decade than the quest to improve the preparation of candidates to close the achievement gap as teachers in high-need schools. As the articles and columns in this issue document, noteworthy in this reform movement has been the increasing attention being paid to the views of classroom teachers in high-need schools in program design, perhaps revealing growing recognition of the importance of experiential learning and supervised classroom practice in preparing candidates for success. Equally significant, recent program reforms reflect recognition of the importance of candidate understanding of the impacts of poverty on student learning and environmental and cultural influences of the surrounding community on high-need schools. As well, there have been concerted attempts to recruit candidates of color to teacher preparation programs in recent years.   Taken together, program improvements are beginning both to graduate candidates who are not only better prepared to teach successfully in high-need schools but who also feel comfortable teaching in settings with ethnic and cultural characteristics that often differ significantly from those of the candidate's background.

The articles and columns in this issue of *Success in High-Need Schools* provide case studies of these reforms in the preparation of new teachers for high-need schools at member colleges and universities of the Associated Colleges of Illinois and elsewhere. Guest columns offer commentary of teacher educators on key features of these programs and priorities going forward, as well as candidate perspectives on program effectiveness and success.

Table of Contents

Publisher's Column, *by Jan Fitzsimmons, Ph.D.* **Reform in Teacher Preparation**

Teacher education programs at colleges and universities are under fire and considered inadequate by many education reformers, both inside and outside Washington, D.C.   As the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA--formerly known as No Child Left Behind)--is being rewritten, "legislators are upping their rhetoric to get tough on colleges."   On September 30, Education Sector held a briefing for Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, who announced a new Obama administration proposal for reforms in education that would directly affect teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities.   Duncan stated that a main goal of this reform is to have states evaluate and act on their teacher preparation programs in three ways: reward those schools identified as "high-performing"; help to improve those in the middle; and shut down those programs determined to be under-performing. To assure a level playing field, Duncan proposed that minority-serving institutions would be given special support to improve.   To sort institutions, Duncan suggests:
  • using a combination of data on graduates' job placement and retention rates;   • performance by graduates on improved teacher licensing exams;   • satisfaction surveys by program graduates and by principals of the institution's graduates teaching in their schools; and   • linking the test scores of a teacher's K-12 students to the teacher preparation program the student's teacher attended.

  Teacher preparation colleges and universities agree that the need to strengthen teacher preparation to ensure that students are career- and college-ready when they graduate from high school is critical.   Many colleges and universities have been striving to improve their programs for some time and are now able to leverage the education reform conversations to drive their innovations forward.   This issue of *Success in High–Need Schools* focuses on those innovations that align with current education reform initiatives though the roots of many of these innovations began long before reformers came to the table.   Jason Helfer points to support for education reform at Knox College as he chronicles   the education reforms that are afoot in Illinois. "… the work load is heavy and the burden is not light," states Helper, "..we are situated in the eye of the perfect storm…"   His column emphasizes the opportunity for teacher preparation programs to leverage education reform conversations to make or advance innovative changes.   In so doing he believes that the reform context creates a "boon" for teacher preparation institutions.   Offering a refreshing perspective on teacher preparation reform, Srimani Chakravarthi examines universal design for learning (UDL), borrowed from the field of architecture, as an approach to reform of teacher education curricula, in the process demonstrating the remarkable convergence between principles of UDL and the new Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS). Universal design for learning is now being used in schools for designing instruction which is accessible to all learners, irrespective of their needs. It is common practice to design accommodations and supplemental teaching strategies for students who fail to learn in general education classrooms. Instead of retrofitting and providing accommodations to individual children, universal design for learning calls for expanding classroom options and providing a flexible curriculum and instruction with multiple built-in options providing access to learners with any kind of need. Thus UDL would consider curricula and learning environments as "disabled" and seek to design them inclusively to student needs, rather than view underperforming students as "disabled."   **Rigorous Clinical Experience**

A critical piece of reform in teacher preparation revolves around the role of experience.   Historically, experience was key to teacher preparation and new teachers and candidates then and now speak to the power of experience in preparing them effectively for professional practice.   Becky Harkema's column adds support to the importance of clinical work particularly clinical work in high-need schools that exposes candidates to the challenges of high-need schools and creates a scaffold to use to attach new information as they progress in their coursework.   An article by O'Connor, Petty and Dagenhart adds further support for experience driven preparation.   Using survey analysis of 401 North Carolina teachers, the researchers ask, "In what way(s) can teacher education programs prepare teacher candidates to work in high-need elementary and middle schools?"   They conclude that "teacher prep" must: 1) require high-need school field placements for all teacher candidates, 2) review required coursework and include work in partnerships, understanding poverty and differentiating instruction, and 3) offer consistent and ongoing support to novice and veteran teachers.   Nancy Gaylen's article details five years of work on increasing the rigor of clinical experiences at Millikin University by implementing a co-teaching model.   The co-teaching model advances the student teaching experience to one in which the student teacher and the cooperating classroom teacher plan together, instruct together, assess together and resolve differences together to meet the individual needs of students in the classroom from day one of the student teaching experience.   The model encourages seven strategies of co-teaching including: 1) one teaches and one observes and annotates student behavior; 2) one teaches and one drifts   to help individual students; 3)station teaching; 4) parallel teaching; 5) supplemental teaching; 6) differentiated instruction; and 7) team teaching.   Gaylen's K-12 partners report that the co-teaching model benefits school partners by encouraging two teachers in the classroom at all times which lowers the student/ pupil ratio, provides new opportunity for differentiated instruction for more students for greater periods of time and increases student engagement time.   Gaylen reports benefits to the candidates and university, too.   Specifically, she notes that the model benefits candidates by providing a rigorous and authentic experience in which student teachers fully enact all aspects of teaching and develop critical knowledge, skills and confidence that are integral to professional practice.   Critical to the success of the co-teaching model described by Gaylen and to all rigorous clinical experiences is the development of clinical faculty.   Vicki Chou discusses the importance and urgency of developing clinical faculty in her column, "The Essential Role of Clinical Faculty in Teacher Preparation for High-Need Schools." Chou equates the role of clinical faculty to "practice professors."   The role of clinical faculty or practice professors includes program leadership and development, teaching professional education courses and doctoral seminars, securing and directing federal professional preparation grants, mentoring new teachers and providing professional support to more experienced teachers, conducting applied research, disseminating new knowledge through standard publication and presentation outlets, as well as   supporting and developing candidates and cooperating teachers in field placements and developing strong relationships with school partners. Chou points with pride to UIC's success in placing successful candidates in high–need schools as a direct result of the development of and investment in full-time clinical faculty with terminal degrees.   **Critical Coursework** In Desiree Pointer Mace's article, "Show AND Tell: Help Teacher Candidates Deepen Understanding of   English Language Learning Students," Mace claims you "can't learn to teach by observation and reading."   She advocates for field-based coursework---closely linking coursework to field experiences.   Mace asks, "How do we help teachers learn to serve increasingly diverse classrooms and develop their moral commitment to support all learners?"   For Mace the answer is simulated experience embedded in an introductory course at Alverno College that engages candidates in a Spanish language immersion so that they have a sense of what everyday school life feels like for second language learners.   In this experience, Mace takes candidates on an experiential journey that demonstrates successful strategies for conveying content to students in a second language and helps them identify and articulate goals and issues in serving growing numbers of English Language Learners. Mace argues for

candidates to develop a "recognition perspective" as she uses simulations that provide a framework for candidates to see and address signature challenges of professional practice and understand the importance of aligning their teaching to their students.   **Evidence** What is the evidence that candidates are ready for professional practice?   Joan McQuillan's article documents the development of another critical reform in education–providing evidence of quality preparation and candidate readiness to address the challenges of teaching in all classrooms--especially in high-need classrooms.   The innovative solution—performance assessment! She declares, "Performance assessments that measure what teachers actually do in the classroom, and which have been found to be related to later teacher effectiveness are a potent tool for evaluating teachers' competence and readiness, as well as for support for needed changes in teacher education." Although Teacher Performance Assessment is a recent reform initiative in Illinois, Illinois College partnered early with Stanford University when California began developing its Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). This article provides a historical analysis of the development of performance assessment as an integral component of candidates' growth and development at Illinois College. It concludes that not only does performance assessment provide evidence of good work in teacher preparation, it provides a road map both for candidate and program improvement.
Selective and Critical Dispositions Finally, we come to Hailey Pocic's column.   In many ways it is the most telling of all because it comes from a new teacher in the rank and file.   In this column Pocic asks, "What do you do when you get hired in February in a high-need school as the fourth teacher employed to teach thirty-three kindergarten students?" She answers, "View each lesson as an opportunity for you to discover how best to teach that are part of overarching curricular goals and experiences.   Assess what students already know about the concepts and determine what they should know by the end of the lesson and the end of the unit.   Think about what stimulates your students' curiosity, what excites them and what they can relate to.   Discover how your students respond to various management techniques and do not be afraid to try new ideas."   Astute researchers would note her persistence and resilience, as well as her ability to master preserve student learning.   Score one for teacher candidate selection!   **Conclusion** With teacher education programs at colleges and universities facing intense scrutiny and widespread criticism for not preparing students to meet the needs of today's students, it is time to focus on successful, innovative programs and practices as described in this Journal.   Colleges and universities are ready, willing and, as these articles and columns demonstrate, able to design and implement successful reforms. Perhaps it is time for some "reformers" to stop pointing the finger at teacher preparation providers and begin beckoning them to the "education reform" table.   It is only through systemic collaboration and the sharing of productive, innovative ideas that we can really improve student achievement.

Jan Fitzsimmons

Jan Fitzsimmons is director of the ACI Center for Success in High-Need Schools and publisher of the Center journal *Success in High-Need Schools.* She may be contacted at jfitzsimmons@acifund.org.

Teaching Children in High-Need Schools: A Call to Teacher Preparation Programs, by Katherine A. O'Connor, Ed.D., Teresa M. Petty, Ed.D., and Diana B. Dagenhart, Ed.D.

Author Bios: Katherine A. O'Connor is an associate professor in the department of curriculum and instruction at East Carolina University. Her teaching and research areas include teacher quality and working conditions, elementary social studies, and academically gifted education. She may be contacted at oconnork@ecu.edu.

Teresa M. Petty is an assistant professor in the middle, secondary, k-12 education department at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her research interests include teacher quality, teacher retention, issues regarding National Board Certification, and mathematics education. She may be contacted at tmpetty@uncc.edu.

Diana B. Dagenhart is a Lecturer at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. She recently retired with 30 years of teaching experience in upper elementary and middle school. Her areas of specialty are middle school science and mathematics. Her research interests include teacher quality and retention, best teaching strategies, and National Board Certification. She may be contacted at dbdagen@uncc.edu.

Abstract

To gather information about ways teacher training programs can prepare preservice teacher candidates to work in high-need schools, an online survey questionnaire was administered to teachers currently teaching in high-need schools in one southeastern state. The data for this study were obtained from elementary school teachers (n=252) and middle school teachers (n=149) who taught in a high-need elementary or middle school during the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school year. Of the 918 teachers who were invited to participate, 401 completed the online survey, yielding a 43.6% response rate. The question, in what ways can teacher education programs prepare preservice teacher candidates to work in high-need elementary and middle schools, guided this research. Teacher participants recommended three approaches to teacher preparation programs: a) requiring high-need school field placements for *all* preservice teachers, b) revisiting college and university teacher education coursework requirements to make revisions including adding courses in community-school partnerships, understanding poverty, and differentiating teaching instruction, and c) offering consistent support to novice and veteran teachers in high-need schools.
Introduction In many professions, a person spends hours training before actually stepping into a job. In the medical field, many years of hands-on training, resources, and medical exams are provided in order for a person to be fully prepared for job situations. In the business field, an accountant studies investments, insolvency issues, bookkeeping and tax services. After passing an exam with a predetermined score, accountants are presumed to have the expertise to manage their clients money. In education, a similar phenomenon occurs. Teacher candidates take courses, observe in classrooms, complete field placements, and, after passing an exam (usually the Praxis), they are awarded a teaching license. However, does the teaching license make them an expert? Are they trained to teach all children? In particular, are they trained to teach children in high-need school settings? Teaching positions, similar to medical or business specialties, differ widely. Gehrke (2005, 15) found that "a mismatch exists between the

backgrounds of most teachers and the students for whom they are responsible." It is the responsibility of teacher educators to maximize the preparation of candidates for the varied teaching circumstances they will face and to ensure that students have equal access to a quality education no matter who is standing in front of them each day. The question of ways teacher education programs might prepare preservice teacher candidates to work successfully in high-need schools guided this research. Our data were obtained primarily from an online survey of elementary school teachers (n=252) and middle school teachers (n=149) who taught in high-need schools during the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school year.   Our primary assumption was that the perspectives of teacher practitioners are essential in designing effective preparation programs. For the purpose of this article, "high-need" is defined as "schools where the percentage of economically disadvantaged students is greater than 80% of the student population."   Economically disadvantaged students are children from families whose income is at or below the levels eligible for free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch, School Breakfast Programs, and/or After School Snack (North Carolina School Report Cards, 2007).   **Literature Review** A review of research about what is necessary for teacher education programs to prepare candidates effectively for teaching in high-need schools allows for comparisons between scholar and practitioner perspectives. Pogrow (2006) has called levels of child poverty a shame nationwide, arguing that "we can make substantial progress in improving high poverty schools – but not the way we are currently operating." He believes that we must think more innovatively about training preservice teacher candidates and administrators to function successfully in high-need schools. Ng (2003) has drawn attention to how college and university teacher preparation programs and school organizational structures contribute to teacher shortages in urban areas as reflected in the reality that most preservice teachers graduating from traditional programs are frequently hesitant to work with low-income minority children.   Watson (2001) proposed that teacher preparation programs improve recruitment efforts for minority teachers, intentionally prepare teachers to work in high-need settings, and increase mentoring of beginning teachers, after finding that the least experienced faculty with high turnover rates and low educational qualifications were serving in schools with the highest population of high-need minority students.   She contended that districts must document attrition rates for new teachers and do more to support teachers in developing discipline and decision-making skills, as well as create a task force to identify schools with the highest turnover rates.   Gehrke (2005) found that one in six American school children lives in poverty and that schools with the largest gap between expectations and achievement are in urban settings. Nonetheless, she concluded that some teachers are successful in even the most difficult schools.   Her examination of these successful teachers revealed three significant characteristics.   First, highly effective, successful teachers in high-need schools are aware of their personal beliefs and understand the differences in their backgrounds and the living conditions of most of their students.   As a consequence, they chose teaching and learning strategies that relate to their students' lives.   Second, they were trained, both preservice candidates and inservice teachers, in dealing with the effects that poverty and a dismal lack of classroom resources have on learning.   This helped them become more aware of the learning environment.   Finally, they held a strong belief that poverty is no excuse for low expectations; therefore, they had high expectations regarding their ability to assist their students to rise to the challenge of the standards-based

accountability system. Teacher educators need to ensure that these characteristics become embedded in their teacher preparation programs. **Survey Methodology** The online survey questionnaire to obtain information about ways teacher preparation programs might prepare teachers to work in high-need schools was administered to current teachers in high-need elementary and middle schools in North Carolina. Forty-seven of 188 high-need elementary schools and 35 of 106 high-need middle schools in the state were randomly selected to participate. Each teacher in the survey sample had an email address and access to the Internet. Of the 82 schools selected, 52 agreed to participate in the study. After receiving permission and obtaining email addresses, an email was sent to every K-8 classroom teacher (n=1096) in the sample group. Due to electronic mail filter issues and incorrect email addresses, 178 questionnaires were returned undelivered. This left a sample of 918 prospective respondents. Of these 918 potential respondents, 401 completed and returned the online survey, yielding a 43.6% response rate. The email invitation included a description of the study, a request to participate with consent, and a link to the online survey. Two weeks following this initial email contact, a follow-up email reminder was sent to those teachers who had not yet responded. A second follow-up reminder email was sent a week later to those who still had not completed the survey. Finally, a third follow-up was sent asking non-responding teachers to complete the survey within five days in order to be included in the data tabulation. The constant comparative method was used to analyze the data. This method involves assessing the data for similarities and differences. Sets of data were produced on a similar dimension and then grouped to create a category (Merriam, 1998). Themes or patterns in the data were determined (Glaser & Straus, 1967). The survey had eight open-ended questions, although for the purpose of this manuscript, the authors have focused solely on the one question, "In what ways can teacher preparation programs prepare beginning teachers to teach in high-need elementary and middle schools?"

Results Survey responses coalesce around several primary conclusions regarding the perceptions of teachers surveyed. Together these conclusions provide a basis for improving teacher preparation programs for candidate effectiveness in teaching in high-need schools. These include: *Infuse Reality* When asked what ways teacher preparation programs could better prepare preservice teacher candidates, the most frequently mentioned recommendation from both elementary and middle school respondents was to require practicum experiences in high-need schools with exposure to strong role models. Among respondent statements: "They all need to work or take a class which requires them to be in the classroom of a high-need school," they need "more experience in these types of schools [with] opportunities to speak with teachers [who] have taught in these schools," and universities, colleges or community colleges "can prepare new teachers for high-need schools by allowing students the opportunity to do their practicum in these schools. Often times students are sent to schools that are at or above standards; this gives them a false sense of reality." The following comment from a novice teacher who responded to the survey expresses succinctly the experience of being unprepared to teach in a high-need school:

As a new teacher [in a high-need school], I was completely out of my element in my school with very little background to go on. Perhaps the best way would be to put student teachers in these [high-need] schools so that they know what to expect once they are out on their own. It is easy to do your student teaching in a school with full parental support, a great PTA, students that are on grade level when you get them, and any other resource you may need. Once out in the real world of a high-needs school, you are not prepared to deal with students that come to you 2 and 3 years behind grade level, no or very little parental support, and very few resources to build things on. In order to prepare beginning teachers adequately for the realities of high-need schools, exposure to and firsthand experiences in high-need schools are non-negotiable imperatives. *Re-examine Required Coursework* The next most frequently mentioned survey response was a recommendation that teacher preparation programs re-examine the required courses preservice teachers need to take. For example, several respondents said that preservice teacher candidates should take required education courses with a poverty focus from instructors who have taught at high-need schools. Other topics respondents mentioned included classroom management and behavior management courses. One respondent said preservice teacher candidates need "training and strong preparation in understanding poverty." Another respondent specifically urged requiring "an entire course on the framework for understanding poverty (by Ruby Payne)." Finally, courses about parent and community interactions and differentiating instruction were also suggested. As one respondent advised, "Make sure they (preservice teacher candidates) understand the impact poverty has on the students and their families and that they understand how people in crisis respond to others." Gaining a better understanding about the community and environment of high-need schools seems critical in the preparation of teachers. *Offer Support* Survey respondents also mentioned that teacher preparation programs need to provide mentoring programs for recent graduates who are employed at high-need schools. One teacher at a high-need school said that institutions of higher education should "offer monthly support for the first year of employment." Due to travel and budget constraints, an online mentoring program would be a relatively inexpensive benefit for the novice teacher and the college or university. The new teacher would be able to email questions to university experts and the university would be able to gather statistics on the types of questions being asked. These data would be ideal for course improvement. Another type of support respondents suggested was offering additional inservice professional development including ELL/ESL training and workshops about how to encompass a variety of learning needs during instruction. One respondent stated that preservice teachers need to "be prepared to teach a varied population of learners." A high-need school elementary teacher noted, "Many of our students are born very prematurely and present new educational needs that other generations of teachers have not had to address." Providing teachers at high-need schools with support networks could benefit both beginning and veteran teachers. **Significance** Nelson (2004) states that most teaching vacancies in our nation occur within high-need, low-performing schools, rather than high performing schools. Many new teachers do not experience success in high-need schools because teacher credentialing programs fall short in preparing them for success in complicated environments such as high-need schools and communities. People familiar with teacher retention and attrition issues have heard this statistic many times: "Almost a third of teachers leave the profession within the first three years, and nearly half leave after five years. In schools serving low-

income communities, the rate (of teachers leaving) is even higher" (Holt & Garcia, 2005).   Teacher preparation programs can respond to the recommendations of high-need school teachers.   First, teacher educators must infuse reality.   In other words, they should require high-need school field placements for *all* preservice teachers. Haberman and Post (1999) propose a zero transfer approach on the assumption that "learning to teach is most powerful when it is under the actual conditions in which one will serve" (p. 103).   Second, colleges and schools of education need to revisit their coursework requirements to ensure that entire courses or at least modules in each course that will help prepare teachers to teach in high-need environments.   Finally, teacher preparation programs need to offer continual support to high-need school teachers, both novice and veteran.   There are many high-need schools nationwide.   As one elementary teacher in a high-need school observed, "colleges need to spend less time inside of textbook world with teachers and expose them more to the classroom before student teaching—our schools are not clean, they are not well heated or cooled, the classroom will have mice and bugs and most of all your kids come to school every day no matter what (because) they need two free meals…the state needs to help." This teacher is correct.   Each state needs to take a serious look at the funds that high-need schools require for teachers, administrators, instructional and professional development resources, and building repairs.   It will take a dramatically improved partnership involving the state, teacher preparation programs, and local communities to eliminate high-need schools.   **References**

Gehrke, R. S. (2005).   Poor schools, poor students, successful teachers. *Kappa Delta Pi Record,* (42), 1, 14-17. Glaser, B. G., & Straus, A. L. (1967).   *The discovery of grounded theory.* Chicago: Aldine. Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1999). Teachers for multicultural schools: The power of selection. *Theory into Practice,* 37 (2), 96-104. Holt, C. B., & Garcia, P. (2005). Preparing teachers for children in poverty: The Nashville district picks up the mantle for qualified instruction in high-need schools. *The School Administrator* (Dec.). Retrieved December 27, 2011, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0JSD/is_11_62/ai_n15970230 Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Nelson, C. (2004).   Reclaiming teacher preparation for success in high-needs schools. *Education,* 124 (3), 475-480. Ng, J. C. (2003). Teacher shortages in urban schools: The role of traditional and alternative certification routes in filling the voids. *Education and Urban Society*, 35 (4), 380-398. North Carolina School Report Cards (2007).   NC School Report Cards Advanced Search. Retrieved December 27, 2011, from http://www.ncreportcards.org/srcadvSearchMoreInfo.jsp?iId=105 Pogrow, S. (2006, October).   The Bermuda Triangle of American education: Pure traditionalism, pure progressivism, and good intentions, *Phi Delta Kappan,* 142-150. Watson, S. (2001).   *Recruiting and retaining teachers: Keys to improving the Philadelphia public schools*.   Report prepared for the Consortium for Policy Research in Education.   Retrieved December 28, 2011, from http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED480407.pdf

Preparation and Support for New Teachers *by Becca Harkema*

Author Bio: Becca Harkema teaches in the Adult Studies Special Education Program at Trinity Christian College and tutors children with a variety of disabilities. She is certified in both Elementary and Special Education and holds a Master's Degree in Differentiated Instruction, Curriculum, and Assessment. She may be contacted at rebecca.harkema@trnty.edu.

Column

"Are you kidding me?" were the first utterances whispered from the new teacher who would be taking over my position in my former classroom. I had just finished giving her the summary of the students in the class, and I could tell from her panic-stricken "deer in head-lights look" that she was about to run out the door. I had spent five years teaching special education in a high-need school, and before I moved on to new endeavors, I wanted to take some time meeting with the new teacher who would be filling my position. As I left our meeting that day, I questioned if I really should have enlightened her about the insights I gained from my high-need school experiences.

In my special education classroom of nine students, I had a plethora of disheartening stories to share. Several examples provide a glimpse of what I shared with that new teacher that day. I had one student being raised by an alcoholic grandmother because her parents were both in prison for sexually abusing her. This student and her siblings were pretty much on their own when it came to feeding themselves, dressing themselves, and getting themselves to school. I had another student whose family was under close supervision of the Department of Children and Family Services for neglect and former abuse. Another one of the students came from a family that had been deported twice (in a time period of fifteen months) to their homeland. Finally, another student was also being raised by grandparents because her father was in prison and her mother was in a mental institution for depression and drug abuse. The list goes on, but the five other students in my former class had similar stories. Can you see why this new teacher wanted to run for the hills? Throw into the mix the fact that in my five years of teaching this class, only three parents had attended parent-teacher conferences, and this new teacher knew she was facing a very daunting task. As I questioned again whether I should have given her this information, I realized that it was essential for her to know the facts. I did not have these facts when I had begun teaching; I felt that I would have been more prepared if I had known the truth about my students and their backgrounds.

How do we prepare new teachers to serve with excellence in high-need schools? The only way to ensure success is to prepare students fully before they enter the field to the realities of high-need schools and then to provide mentoring and support while they teach in high-need schools (and not just for the first year). If new teachers feel they are called to teach in a high-need school, they need a reality check that occurs long before the first day of school in their new job. In my teacher preparation program, I had beautiful dreams and visions of what my future classroom would look like. Students were neatly groomed and always had what they needed, parents were supportive and volunteered to help with whatever the class needed, and I was always happy in the job that I had "dreamed" of doing. My reality check came on day one when none of my students came with school supplies; about half of them mentioned they had not eaten breakfast. My "perfect" visions quickly disappeared as I started searching through supply cabinets for pencils and any supplies I could get my hands on.

This leads me to suggest that new teachers who desire to work in high-need schools need as much exposure as possible to these schools before they begin their careers.   This means that students need to vocalize their aspirations of working in high-need schools in their teacher preparation programs so that they can be placed in as many field experiences as possible in high-need schools.   After many field experiences, students need to complete one of their two student teaching placements in a high-need school to confirm their feelings that this is where they belong.   By completing all of these experiences and having multiple exposures to the realities of teaching in a high-need school, students will know from the very beginning of their careers what teaching in a high-need school really means.

Once students have confirmed through these experiences that they desire to work in a high-need school, they need to be placed with a support system that will be with them the entire time they are in that teaching position.   Why do we feel teachers only need mentors or support during their very first year?   In all honesty, working in a high-need school can be challenging and discouraging for any teacher, and all would benefit from the support and help of a mentor who can relate to the specific issues that come along with this setting.

Preparation and adequate support are necessities if we want new teachers to be successful in high-need schools.   I do not feel guilty about informing the new teacher about the realities of the classroom she was taking over.   In fact, she thanked me for my honesty because she knew what to look for and how to prepare.   I even gave her my email address and told her to contact me anytime she had questions or needed support.   She has taken advantage of that offer multiple times, and I know she (and the students) have benefited from that resource.

Finally, don't worry; I made sure to inform the new teacher of all the positives of my former classroom that day.   I told her that one student will tell you every day that you are the best teacher ever.   One will draw you a picture each day and insist that you hang it on your desk (until you literally do not have room for anything except those works of art and love). Another student will chatter your ear off all day long because you are someone in his life who will listen to him.   Our students in high-need schools deserve teachers who are prepared to teach them; let's offer new teachers the support and preparation they need to be successful.

The Essential Role of Clinical Faculty in Teacher Preparation for High-Need Schools *by Victoria Chou, Ph.D.*

Author Bio: Victoria Chou, Ph.D., is dean of the College of Education at the University of Illinois Chicago.   Prior to her deanship she was a classroom teacher, a reading specialist, and a teacher educator and reading researcher. Her focus on developing a model "Great Cities" school of teacher education at UIC has received national attention. She chairs the governing board of the National Teachers Academy-Professional Development School. She may be contacted at vchou@uic.edu.

Column

When I was an assistant professor on the track to tenure way back in the mid-1970s, my academic year was marked by the sheer insanity of making dozens of clinical placements in a very short timeframe each semester. Placements were followed by cycles of school visits to my preservice teachers, first all over the map in Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia; and later all over the Chicagoland area.   My unpaid summers were spent analyzing the data I'd madly collected during the school year and writing up my research for publication, lest I "perish" at tenure time.

I inhabited two fulfilling and desirable identities—teacher educator/field instructor and researcher—but I could not bring the two identities into any semblance of balance.   I could not help but notice that this "Janus" state was uniquely characteristic of faculty charged with responsibility for the early fieldwork of teacher preparation programs that are most commonly—albeit not exclusively—concentrated in departments of curriculum and instruction or teacher education.   Other faculty stepped into schools only to conduct research.   Or university supervisors without faculty appointments and with no other connection to the teacher preparation program were hired to handle the   time-consuming work of supervising student teaching.

Oh, how times have changed at our place!   Starting in the 1990s, a handful of our teacher preparation programs decided to commit to placing teacher candidates exclusively in Chicago's public schools, and a greater proportion than before in Chicago's poorest, racially segregated schools, as opposed to magnet or selective enrollment schools.   The thinking was that our candidates had to practice teaching in such schools, if they were to learn how to teach well in such schools.   We had to build relationships in unfamiliar schools and communities more accustomed to having researchers marching in and studying their children, schools that initially regarded our approach with suspicion.   We quickly realized we could not and should not rely on part-time adjunct faculty to establish the necessary long-term relationships we sought to support our teacher candidates.   Out of this realization grew our commitment to differentiating the standard faculty role and creating and investing in full-time clinical faculty positions.

Our clinical faculty role is similar to what are known as "practice professors" in other institutions, central to recent (re)conceptualizations of teaching as a clinical practice profession (AACTE, 2010).   Today approximately one-fifth of our faculty members are clinical faculty funded from our base state budget; several others are externally funded from professional preparation grants.   Most have terminal degrees in their fields, but not all do; nearly all of our clinical faculty have had classroom teaching experience and prior experience mentoring teacher or school leader candidates.   We have promotion norms and an established clinical faculty promotion process, developed by clinical and tenured faculty; clinical faculty serve on the promotion committee.   Newcomers to the College cannot differentiate

between tenure-line and clinical faculty in terms of full participation in the life of the College, and the intellectual exchanges among clinical and tenure-line faculty are regularly acknowledged to be beneficial to both.

Our original clinical faculty position descriptions focused almost exclusively on the placement and supervision of teacher candidates, with teaching confined to the seminar accompanying the clinical experience.   Roles are no longer so prescriptively configured; rather, responsibilities depend upon each program's special demands.   Clinical faculty responsibilities, now negotiated with department chairs, have expanded to include program leadership and development, teaching professional education courses and the occasional doctoral seminar, securing and directing federal professional preparation grants, mentoring new teachers and providing professional support to more experienced teachers, conducting applied research, and disseminating new knowledge through standard publication and presentation outlets.   One clinical faculty member supported both our faculty and partner schools in the use of instructional technology; another collaborates on program design and supervises the clinical faculty who coach our principal interns; still another is dedicated to developing on-line programming with other faculty, and two others focus exclusively on supporting science education and mathematics education, respectively.

In some ways, the role affords more faculty flexibility, creativity, and control over one's work than the standard faculty model does, witness clinical faculty receiving two of our three American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Best Practice Awards in recent years.

Clinical faculty members' intentional hybrid scholar/practitioner roles make them quintessential boundary spanners, working between school and university, between researchers and practitioners, and within and across programs.   They are trusted intermediaries, when things go awry in a communication or a relationship, as they sometimes will.   They pave the way into school communities for other faculty members who may offer or seek support.   A number of our clinical faculty have such exemplary and durable relationships with particular CPS schools that their former student teachers are now mentoring our newest student teachers in these schools.   It is no wonder, as a result, that some CPS schools have exceptionally high concentrations of UIC teachers.

While we all await the inevitable development of longitudinal student databases that will link teacher outcomes two ways—forward to student outcomes and backward to teacher preparation programs, we point with justifiable pride to alternative meaningful indicators of clinical faculty members' work.   In two rounds of self-study, we've demonstrated that teacher candidates with clinical experiences in high-poverty, predominantly African American schools will more likely teach in high-poverty, predominantly African American schools, regardless of race of teacher candidate.   We found a similar result for Latino school clinical placements and first teaching position choices.   We see these positive correlations as hopeful signs that the school relationships cultivated by our experienced, full-time clinical faculty members have in turn supported prospective teachers who have the knowledge, skills, and confidence to *choose* to teach (typically) "other people's children," without the need for teacher pay incentives to go where the need is greatest.

The clinical preparation of teachers: A policy brief.   (2010).   Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Overcoming the "Perfect Storm" in the Preparation of New Teachers in Illinois *by Jason Helfer, Ph.D*

Author Bio: Jason Helfer, Ph.D., is associate professor and co-chair of the department of educational studies at Knox College, and a member of ISBE elementary and middle school advisory committee. He may be contacted at jhelfer@knox.edu.

Column

Teacher preparation in Illinois is in the midst of what some are calling a "perfect storm." On the one hand, teacher educators feel the pressure to prepare candidates more effectively, especially to close the achievement gap in high-need schools. These efforts include increasing candidate supervised classroom practice as part of preparation programs. Yet, a weak economy has restricted the ability of districts to hire new teachers and schools increasingly under pressure to raise test scores may be reluctant to accept practicum and student teaching placements. On top of tensions inherent in these circumstances, Illinois state requirements for new teacher licenses are in flux. By 2013, all institutions of higher education offering educator licensure programs must have all programs approved using the new Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) and introduce the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). The TPA may take the place of the APT (assessment of preparation for teaching). Although they are causing widespread anxiety, these two changes are not "new" as the State and institutions of higher education were made aware of them, and there are organizations established to support schools who wish to pilot the TPA.

As for the likely changes that are new and, potentially, more challenging, colleges and universities will need to develop and have approved a middle school preparation program, revisit competencies in the elementary education program, move toward a more extensive and selective set of clinical experiences (including student teaching), and ensure that students, faculty, and other stakeholders are aware of these changes. These emerging changes have been the focus of discussions in which I have participated in the Elementary and Middle School Advisory Group (EMAG) which commenced in February 2011.

Coupled with the contents of SB 1799, recently signed into law by Governor Quinn, the initial charge for EMAG was to ponder if it is necessary to create two separate endorsement areas, one for elementary classrooms and one for middle school. From this discussion developed questions such as, "What should be the cut off from one endorsement to the next?" and "Should there be an overlap between the endorsements (e.g., K-5 and 5-8)?" At the June 2011 meeting it appeared that the elementary endorsement would consist of grades K-5 and a separate middle school endorsement would cover grades 6-8. Practicing teachers and building administrators on the committee were helpful in thinking through the advantages and disadvantages of such a recommendation. These decisions were grounded in considerations behind the IPTS and the Common Core Standards in Reading/Writing and Mathematics.

In analyzing the standards in detail it was discovered that there is a "break" between the skills and knowledge taught in grade five and what is taught in grade six. With this in mind, the EMAG has spent considerable time discussing the competencies necessary for teachers at the elementary and middle school levels. This discussion reflects the state of flux teacher preparation programs are experiencing as a result of the changes the IPTS and TPA require and the proposed addition of a middle school teacher education major.

Keeping abreast of changes in licensure rules is challenging.   Often, it seems as if a program or unit risks making major program revisions that will be short lived as licensure rules continue to evolve.   Nonetheless, the movement of the State toward revising and consolidating the IPTS to focus on differentiation, literacy, and the planning and delivery of instruction (to mention but a few changes) makes the rules document and the responsibilities of teacher educators and candidates clearer.   This "consolidation" of license, standards, and the possibility of revamping the certification testing system (TPA instead of APT) will work to the benefit of   preparation programs, young teachers, and more importantly, those with whom they will soon work.

While the notion of change is pervasive in teacher preparation, it is important to take advantage of the structure provided by ISBE, the creativity of colleagues, and the opportunity to imagine how an institution ought to proceed. As repeatedly mentioned in EMAG meetings, the expected changes are not meant to be superficial (e.g., changing a course name or even the content of a course – even though both will occur, most likely).   Rather, the changes ought to provide a foundation from which programs or units can investigate their desires for teacher candidates throughout their program of study *and* for their graduates professional development once employed in the schools. Thinking about the competencies of teachers that can be developed over time should be a more reassuring idea than considering how a program or unit must meet each standard as identified through a matrix.   it is true that ISBE requires a new IPTS matrix, course syllabi, and rubrics for new program approval, but the chance to modify the mission of the department or school of education based upon collective agreement in the development of the IPTS, Common Core Standards, and TPA is a rare and positive break with past accreditation practices.

There is also ample room for teacher educator programs to reflect upon how their individual missions can support the general threads of the NCATE standards used in program review, i.e., developing a unit assessment system which will provide evaluation of teacher candidate   knowledge and skills (content and pedagogical) and dispositions, while grounding decisions in the new IPTS and Common Core Standards. Giving consideration to the standards and assessments that our colleagues across the United States have constructed is a boon for all those who prepare teachers in Illinois.   Certainly, the teacher educator work load is heavy and the burden is not light, but we are situated in the eye of this perfect storm and most substantial licensure changes come from our ranks. Those of us involved with these reforms know that this is a collective venture for the good of the teaching profession and the children in the public schools.

Measuring up to the IPTS using Universal Design for Learning by Srimani Chakravarthi, Ph. D.

Author Bio: Srimani Chakravarthi, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the College of Education at the University of St. Francis In Joliet, IL.   She may be contacted at schakravarthi@stfrancis.edu.

Abstract
This paper examines universal design for learning (UDL) in the light of the new Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) (Illinois State Board of Education, 2011) and the requirements underlining the standards. Universal design for learning, an established concept in the field of architecture, is now being used in schools for designing instruction which is accessible to all learners, irrespective of their need. It is common practice to design accommodations and supplemental teaching strategies for students who fail to learn in general education classrooms. Instead of retrofitting and providing accommodations to individual children, universal design for learning calls for expanding classroom options and providing a flexible curriculum and instruction with multiple built-in options providing access to learners with any kind of need. Rose and Meyer (2006, viii) posed these questions: "What if all learners had genuine opportunities to learn in inclusive environments? What if we recognized that our inflexible curricula and learning environments are 'disabled' rather than pinning that label on learners who face unnecessary barriers?"

This paper analyzes universal design and the component checkpoints under the UDL principles and matches them with specific performance indicators under the IPTS which they correlate to. The intent of this correlation is to demonstrate the need for training teacher candidates with universal design for learning enabling them to master many of the state of Illinois' performance standards for teachers.

Introduction
The newly revised Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) (ISBE, 2010) emphasize the growing need of the hour: enabling *each and every* student to succeed in the classroom. This standard reflects the growing number of student populations with diverse backgrounds, needs, abilities, cultures and language. IPTS indicator 1: Teaching Diverse Students states that *"The competent teacher understands the diverse characteristics and abilities of each student and how individuals develop and learn within the context of their social, economic, cultural, linguistic, and academic experiences. The teacher uses these experiences to create instructional opportunities that maximize student learning."* The challenge for teachers and teacher educators is how to meet the needs of all students in the classroom while maximizing learning. This paper examines universal design for learning as a means to achieve the ambitious new IPTS standards.

Designing instruction to suit different learning needs is popularly achieved through the evidence-based practice of differentiating the content, process and product (Tomlinson, 2000). Although the idea of differentiating instruction is more than a decade old, the practice has not trickled down into the classrooms at a rate promising for success. The reasons for this range across a lack of teacher knowledge, skills & training in specific differentiating strategies. So, how do we actually differentiate the content, process and product? How do we know we are differentiating instruction? Universal design for learning (UDL) provides a blueprint for differentiation. The concept of universal design principles and the integration of technology are mandated by the Individuals with Disabilities Education

Improvement Act (IDEA, 2004) and the Higher Education Opportunity Act (2008) to enable educators to reach every student in the classroom effectively.

Universal design for learning
Universal design for learning is not a new concept. Borrowed from the field of architecture, the concept involves designing structures which enable access to all, irrespective of their limiting conditions (Rose, Meyer & Hitchcock, 2005). Wheelchair ramps, accessible restrooms, handrails, and closed captioning are all examples of universal design. Although these are designed for individuals with special needs, persons without handicaps often find ramps and handicapped access useful in opening doors and use closed captioning in airports, gymnasiums and quiet environments. The premise of universal design is that refitting buildings with such accommodations at a later time results in much more effort and expense.

Adapting universal design to education calls on teachers to design lesson plans with supports built in to suit learners with diverse needs, rather than providing remedial instruction ("retrofitting") for those who cannot succeed at a later time. The premise is that our traditional lesson plans have barriers imbedded within them. UDL calls for the use of low and high technology to remove some common barriers and, thereby, make lessons accessible to all learners (Rose, Meyer & Hitchcock, 2005).   UDL is scientifically based on brain research, specifically the three main brain networks involved with learning: the recognition network, the strategic network and the affective network. The recognition network engages the "what" aspect of learning, i.e., recognizing facts, procedures & concepts. The strategic network involves the "how" aspect of learning which enables us to find ways to remember procedures, sequences and processes. The affective network concerns the "why" aspects of learning, involving the feelings, engagement and motivation to learn (Center for Applied Special Technology, 2011).

In designing a lesson, these three aspects of the brain network need to be considered to result in effective learning; since individuals recognize (perceive), strategize (remember) and feel differently about different content and presentation, options must be provided for optimal learning among people with diverse abilities. This diversity is reflected in varied auditory, visual, oral, motor, behavioral and cultural/linguistic abilities among students, both in perception and expression. In planning for these diverse modalities, we are better able to achieve equal access to lessons by all learners in the classroom.

How does UDL actually look in the classroom? Here are a few examples: Joe struggles with decoding complex words, especially in subjects such as geography. His teacher provides him with audio versions of the textbook to help him to comprehend its content along with scaffolds such as highly readable texts and visual aids for vocabulary words during his geography class. Providing a visual of the word during class and listening while reading both provide Joe the scaffolds he needs to succeed.   Aliya is a freshman in high school and she struggles with writing. Observing that her ability to articulate orally far excels her composition skills, her teachers allows her to use a speech-to-text program and a word prediction program while drafting and revising her papers. These scaffolds assist her to express her ability and skills in the content area.   Students like Joe and Aliya with varying abilities need not be limited in gaining access to learning. Audio books, visuals and writing software are just a few of the possible options that can benefit not only them, but also many other students with varying levels of reading and writing.

Universal design for learning is based on three main principles that guide curriculum design,   instruction and assessment:
   • "Multiple means to Represent: give diverse learners options for   acquiring information and knowledge,
   • Multiple means to Express: give learners options for demonstrating   what they know,
   • Multiple means to Engage: tap into learners' interests, offer appropriate   challenges, and increase motivation" (Center for Applied Special   Technology [CAST] 2011).

The Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) which has been involved in promoting UDL, offers various resources for teachers and teacher educators, including UDL videos, modules to learn about UDL, sample lesson plans, lesson planning templates and resources to use to provide multiple options. There are numerous research studies that support the use of different options in representing, expressing and engaging (See National Center on Universal Design for Learning, 2011).   The principles of UDL are further elaborated through guidelines under each principle and detailed checkpoints under each guideline.

Universal design and Illinois Professional Teaching Standards
Universal design provides tools and skills to achieve various benchmarks put forth in the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. It is clear that designing lessons following universal design guidelines will enable access to diverse learners in the classroom, as explicitly required in the new IPTS. Using UDL guidelines provided by the Center for Applied Special Technology [CAST] (2011), an analysis of the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010) performance indicators was done to examine the alignment of the two. Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 illustrate the alignment of UDL guidelines with the IPTS standards.

Table 1.1: Aligning UDL Principle 1 with IPTS standards

Principle 1: Provide Multiple Means of Representation	
UDL guidelines and checkpoints	**IPTS performance indicators**
Guideline 1: Provide options for perception	
Offer ways of customizing the display of information	1H. analyzes and uses student information to design instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and leads to ongoing growth and achievement
	1L. uses information about students' individual experiences, families, cultures, and communities to create meaningful learning opportunities and enrich instruction for all students.
	5M. uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with a range of abilities and experiences
Offer alternatives for auditory information	6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers)
Offer alternatives for visual information	6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced

Principle 1: Provide Multiple Means of Representation

UDL guidelines and checkpoints	IPTS performance indicators
Guideline 1: Provide options for perception	
Offer ways of customizing the display of information	1H. analyzes and uses student information to design instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and leads to ongoing growth and achievement 1L. uses information about students' individual experiences, families, cultures, and communities to create meaningful learning opportunities and enrich instruction for all students. 5M. uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with a range of abilities and experiences
Offer alternatives for auditory information	6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers)
Offer alternatives for visual information	6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers)
Guideline 2: Provide options for language, mathematical expressions, and symbols	
Clarify vocabulary and symbols	5J. monitors and adjusts strategies in response to feedback from the student 6L. facilitates the use of appropriate word identification and vocabulary strategies to develop each student's understanding of content
Clarify syntax and structure	5L. develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students' understanding and presenting diverse perspectives to encourage critical and creative thinking
Support decoding of text, mathematical notation, and symbols	
Promote understanding across languages	
Illustrate through multiple media	2M. uses a variety of explanations and multiple representations of concepts that capture key ideas to help each student develop conceptual understanding and address common misunderstandings
Guideline 3: Provide options for comprehension	
Activate or supply background knowledge	1I. stimulates prior knowledge and links new ideas to already familiar ideas and experiences;

Table 1.2: Aligning UDL Principle 2 with IPTS standards

Principle 1: Provide Multiple Means of Representation	
UDL guidelines and checkpoints	**IPTS performance indicators**
Guideline 1: Provide options for perception	
Offer ways of customizing the display of information	1H. analyzes and uses student information to design instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and leads to ongoing growth and achievement
	1L. uses information about students' individual experiences, families, cultures, and communities to create meaningful learning opportunities and enrich instruction for all students.
	5M. uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with a range of abilities and experiences
Offer alternatives for auditory information	6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers)
Offer alternatives for visual information	6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers)
Guideline 2: Provide options for language, mathematical expressions, and symbols	
Clarify vocabulary and symbols	5J. monitors and adjusts strategies in response to feedback from the student
	6L. facilitates the use of appropriate word identification and vocabulary strategies to develop each student's understanding of content
Clarify syntax and structure	5L. develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students' understanding and presenting diverse

Principle 1: Provide Multiple Means of Representation

UDL guidelines and checkpoints	IPTS performance indicators
Guideline 1: Provide options for perception	
Offer ways of customizing the display of information	1H. analyzes and uses student information to design instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and leads to ongoing growth and achievement 1L. uses information about students' individual experiences, families, cultures, and communities to create meaningful learning opportunities and enrich instruction for all students. 5M. uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with a range of abilities and experiences
Offer alternatives for auditory information	6I. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers)
Offer alternatives for visual information	6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers)
Guideline 2: Provide options for language, mathematical expressions, and symbols	
Clarify vocabulary and symbols	5J. monitors and adjusts strategies in response to feedback from the student 6L. facilitates the use of appropriate word identification and vocabulary strategies to develop each student's understanding of content
Clarify syntax and structure	5L. develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students' understanding and presenting diverse perspectives to encourage critical and creative thinking
Support decoding of text, mathematical notation, and symbols	
Promote understanding across languages	
Illustrate through multiple media	2M. uses a variety of explanations and multiple representations of concepts that capture key ideas to help each student develop conceptual understanding and address common misunderstandings
Guideline 3: Provide options for comprehension	
Activate or supply background knowledge	1I. stimulates prior knowledge and links new ideas to already familiar ideas and experiences;

Table 1.3: Aligning UDL Principle 3 with IPTS standards

Principle 1: Provide Multiple Means of Representation

UDL guidelines and checkpoints	IPTS performance indicators
Guideline 1: Provide options for perception Offer ways of customizing the display of information	1H. analyzes and uses student information to design instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and leads to ongoing growth and achievement 1L. uses information about students' individual experiences, families, cultures, and communities to create meaningful learning opportunities and enrich instruction for all students. 5M. uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with a range of abilities and experiences 6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs and struggling and advanced readers)

Offer alternatives for auditory information

Offer alternatives for visual information

Guideline 2: Provide options for language, mathematical expressions, and symbols
Clarify vocabulary and symbols

Clarify syntax and structure

Support decoding of text, mathematical notation, and symbols

Promote understanding across languages

Illustrate through multiple media

Guideline 3: Provide options for comprehension
Activate or supply background knowledge

6J. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs and struggling and advanced readers)

6L. selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs and struggling and advanced readers)

5M. monitors and adjusts strategies in response to feedback from the student

6I. facilitates the use of appropriate word identification and vocabulary strategies to develop each student's understanding of content

5L. develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students' understanding and presenting diverse perspectives to encourage critical and creative thinking

2M. uses a variety of explanations and multiple representations of concepts that capture key ideas to help each student develop conceptual understanding

5L. develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students' understanding

Findings and Conclusion

The above tables demonstrate that the universal design for learning contains checkpoints which correlate closely with many benchmarks from six of the nine IPTS standards. Universal design for learning holds great potential for increasing the success of the increasingly diverse learners in today's classrooms by providing explicit guidelines for differentiating the curriculum, instruction and assessment. Teaching preservice and inservice teachers how to plan lessons that are universally designed enables teachers to master numerous performance indicators established through the newly revised Illinois Professional Teaching Standards for educators. The IPTS has established a clear need for use of methods such as universal design. Training in UDL should become an important part of the teacher preparation program in any higher education setting.

References

Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST). (2011). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines,* version 2.0. Wakefield, MA: Author.

Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA). (2008).   Public Law 110-315, 20 U. S. C.

Illinois State Board of Education. (2010). *Illinois Content-Area Standards. Illinois Professional Teaching Standards*. Retrieved from http://www.isbe.net/profprep/PDFs/prfstandards.pdf

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA). (2004).   Public Law 108-446, 20 U. S. C.

National Center on Universal Design for Learning. (2011). *Research Evidence*. Retrieved from http://www.udlcenter.org/research/researchevidence/

Rose, D.   H., Meyer, A.   & Hitchcock, C. Eds. (2005).   *The Universally designed classroom – Accessible Curriculum and Digital Technologies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. Eds. (2006). *A practical reader in universal design for learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). Differentiation of instruction in the elementary grades. *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED443572.

Teacher Performance Assessment: An Opportunity for Collaboration, Learning, and Effecting Change in Teacher Preparation *by Joan McQuillan*

Author Bio: Joan McQuillan is a visiting instructor and teaching performance assessment (TPAC) coordinator in the department of education at Illinois College in Jacksonville. She may be contacted at jmcquill@mail.ic.edu.

Abstract

Sustaining a fervent commitment to improving the quality of teaching and learning requires an obligation to not only measure teacher effectiveness, but also to develop and nurture it. In her recent report for the Center for American Progress, Linda Darling-Hammond (2010) asserts that teacher performance assessments that "measure what teachers actually do in the classroom, and which have been found to be related to later teacher effectiveness, are a much more potent tool for evaluating teachers' competence and readiness, as well as for supporting needed changes in teacher education." Can a teacher performance assessment designed to measure the readiness of student teachers to be the teachers of record in their classrooms provide teacher preparation programs with a timely and crucial means to measure novice teacher effectiveness, to inform institutional practice and affect program change, and to extend an opportunity to faculty and teacher candidates alike to continue to learn and grow professionally so that new teachers enter the field as highly effective professional educators?

In an effort to explore this question and find answers, Illinois College partnered with Stanford University to pilot the Performance Assessment for California Teachers with junior block candidates during the spring of 2009. Later that summer, Illinois College joined the Performance Assessment for California Teachers Consortium (PACT) as one of two member institutions outside of California. Piloting of the PACT continued through the fall of 2009 and implementation of the PACT teacher performance assessment began in the spring of 2010 and continued through the fall of 2010. During the summer and fall of 2010, Stanford University invited the Teacher Preparation Programs at Illinois College to become involved in the national pilot of a newly developed teacher performance assessment (TPA) developed by TPAC, the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium. Illinois College accepted the challenge and transitioned from PACT to the national TPAC TPA piloted in the spring of 2011. During the 2011-2012 academic year, Illinois College teacher candidates are contributing data to the field testing of the TPAC TPA. This article describes these collaborations and the results in relation to the question of the effectiveness of teacher performance assessments regarding student teacher readiness.

Introduction
The research on school improvement and reform efforts of the past twenty years strongly support the impact of highly skilled teachers on student learning and achievement and on the success of school improvement initiatives. According to Darling-Hammond, "One of the few areas of consensus among policymakers, practitioners, and the general public today is that improving teacher quality is one of the most direct and promising strategies for improving public education outcomes in the United States, especially for groups of children who have historically been taught by the least qualified teachers." (2010) Citing the results of a "large-scale" study from North Carolina, Darling-Hammond reports that "differences in achievement gains for students who had the most qualified teachers versus those who had the least qualified were greater than the influence of race and parent education combined." Further, as Chung and Pechone (2010) explain, "recent changes in national accreditation processes have put teacher education programs under the microscope, and the policy environment increasingly demands that teacher education programs provide evidence that their graduates have learned to teach." Institutions of higher learning engaged in the preparation of teachers must, therefore, assume considerable responsibility for assuring society that highly effective candidates are entering the profession ready to be teachers of record prepared to accomplish the expected target: all students will succeed in learning and achieving the high standards set for them.

The PACT Experience
In the early fall of 2008, *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do*, a powerful book by Linda Darling-Hammond and John Bransford, sparked an interest in improving the Illinois College teacher preparation program. While we were aware that the development of our preservice candidates requires more than passing scores on the high stakes summative assessments of basic skills, content knowledge and professional teaching competence, as measured by the written exams the Illinois Certification Testing System (JCTS) requires, and that these required summative assessments provide quantitative evidence of a candidate's competency, Illinois College, like other PACT Consortium members also felt, that "highly qualified" teacher candidates should possess further competencies--those which define the very core of effective teaching. Would a performance assessment alone provide the evidence necessary to assist us in meeting the challenges of preparing highly skilled teachers for "a changing world" (Darling-Hammond and Bransford, 2008)?

We began the search for an evidenced-based performance assessment with predictive value that would assist education faculty members to assess teacher candidates adequately formatively and summatively to verify with confidence their status as "highly qualified" novice educators prepared to teach all students. This exploration guided us to the performance assessment work being done at Stanford University and the PACT consortium. After communicating with Ray Pechone and Kendyll Stansbury at Stanford, we decided to pilot the PACT with our junior block students in the spring of 2009. Because of this pilot experience, Illinois College entered into an institutional partnership with the PACT consortium that initiated a shift from our traditional model of preservice teacher education and assessment to a more informative, transparent, and performance-based approach. Joining the collegial, collaborative PACT--committed to a "culture of evidence" in teacher preparation programs--caused us to continue piloting the authentic assessment system which meets the "California Quality Standards" for reliability and validity, i.e., AERA, APA, NCME test standards (Pecheone & Stansbury, 2009). California accepted PACT as one of two performance assessment systems that can be utilized to provide evidence that institutions graduate candidates who have "learned to teach." (Chung & Pecheone, 2010) Moreover, we found it

highly attractive that in fostering program revision and improvement PACT advances both individual and institutional learning.

Modeled on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards portfolio, this performance assessment system "consists of two interconnected components: the Teaching Event (TE) standardized portfolio assessment and locally developed Embedded Signature Assessments (ESAs). This evidence-based evaluation system was designed to serve both as a formative assessment tool and as a high stakes summative evaluation instrument. Chung and Pechone (2010) describe the formative capacity of the TE for preservice teacher candidates, teacher educators, faculty and teacher preparation programs as:

 . . . related to the analytical nature of the rubrics and the specific information that the rubric scores provide about the strengths and weaknesses of preservice teachers' instructional practice. The design of the rubrics and the way in which they are written allow some transparency in interpreting the score results by providing concrete images of beginning teacher practice at various levels. This is supportive of program faculty who want to provide formative feedback to candidates as they construct their Teaching Events as well as to programs engaging in the analysis of aggregate scores for the purpose of program review and revision.

Our involvement with PACT permitted our department to think about developing and measuring candidate growth formatively and summatively and to assess other proficiencies that those involved with teacher preparation will recognize as critical skills for highly effective professional educators: 1) knowledge of contextual factors that impact instruction;   2) capability in design of instruction and assessment based on contextual knowledge and specific learner needs;   3) expertise in lesson/segment planning grounded in theory and research; 4) use of reflection, assessment data analysis, and interpretation to inform future practice; 5) ability to reflect on both daily instruction and an entire learning segment or unit; 6) facility in justifying decisions that impact student learning and advise ongoing practice--identifying problems and solving them; 7) effective classroom management regarding efficacy and effectiveness in planning, preparation, and instruction, as well as support for the success of all learners as individuals, subgroups, and the whole group; and 8) competency with differentiation of instruction for all students, particularly English language learners, learners from different cultural and/or socioeconomic backgrounds, and learners with special needs, including talented and gifted. Our experiences with the PACT at Illinois College, suggest that it measures dispositions expected of effective professional educators dedicated to fairness and providing access to learning for all students the quantitative and qualitative "feedback data" generated by PACT/TE scoring and ESA performances enabled us to analyze student learning, inform our current practice, and improve our teacher preparation program, as well as to encourage our faculty members to embrace a continuous program improvement model using inquiry, program revision, and focused problem solving to drive the data analysis.

Such inquiry provided learning experiences for faculty members, times for identifying "what our students really know based on what we think we're teaching them" (Peck and MacDonald, 2009), and using that information for program improvement by engaging in collaboration and focused problem solving. This is supportive of program faculty who want to provide formative feedback to candidates as they construct their Teaching Events, as well as to programs engaging in the analysis of aggregate scores for the purpose of program review and revision.

The department moved from the PACT piloting process to the implementation phase during spring 2010 student teaching. Collectively, our education faculty began to feel more comfortable and confident with

the instrument as a summative evaluation tool that could be used to help inform the final decision making process when considering a candidate's readiness to become the teacher of record in his/her own classroom. Through the data collection and analysis the potential for using this data to inform course revision and program improvement had become clear.

The "feedback data" from our initial implementation was gathered from the group of thirty-four secondary, elementary, and early childhood student teaching candidates with whom we had piloted the performance assessment formatively the previous spring. As we interpreted this data, strengths and weaknesses of individual student teachers, content specific subgroups (secondary math, social studies/history, English/language arts, science, world languages, and physical education and early childhood and elementary literacy and numeracy), and the group of candidates as a whole became apparent. Quantitatively, the data showed that thirty of the student teachers had passed the PACT and four had not.

Based on the quantitative and qualitative evidence available education faculty members developed and instituted remediation plans collaboratively with three of the student teachers who failed specific PACT tasks and with one secondary candidate who failed almost all of the teacher performance tasks. This proved to be an educational experience for all involved. The four students learned from reviewing, self-evaluating, and revising or redoing their work, while department members involved in candidate remediation gained information that would impact future practice in preservice courses and could aid department efforts to improve the Illinois College's teacher preparation program.

Further interpretation of the teacher performance assessment feedback data for the group overall revealed that planning tasks were a strength and a need for improvement with assessment, reflection, and academic language tasks. Using the scoring data and the evidence provided by PACT task artifacts and commentaries, the education faculty decided that because the area of academic language was new to department members each of us needed to learn more about academic language beyond content specific vocabulary. To provide a common starting point for this professional development effort, our department chair agreed to order multiple copies of *Building Academic Language: Essential Practices for Content Classrooms, Grades 5-12* by Jeff Zwiers, a resource suggested at the annual 2009 PACT implementation conference in Santa Barbara. Additionally, individual instructors pondered how their increasing knowledge of academic language could be incorporated in their courses for the upcoming 2010-2011 academic year. Additionally, course revisions addressing formative and summative assessment, feedback, and possible ways to improve reflective practice were targeted.

PACT implementation continued with the student teaching group for fall 2010 consisting of eight candidates. Two dual majors in Spanish and elementary education and preservice candidates in physical education, music education, secondary math, and elementary education comprised this cohort. The music education and the two double major teacher candidates to explore the flexibility and adaptability of the PACT to context and content. In a sense the department was actually piloting the Teaching Event with these three preservice educators.

The student teachers with double majors were placed in a dual language program at Gard Elementary School in Beardstown, Illinois and the music candidate student taught in the vocal music program at Jacksonville High School and Turner Junior High School in Jacksonville. Although all of our supervisors had been trained following PACT guidelines and had experience as calibrated PACT

scorers, none of our mentors/scorers had expertise in music education and only two of them had a Spanish language background. To address the learning needs of the vocal music candidate and ensure her the opportunity for professional growth and development during the student teaching semester, we paired an experienced scorer/supervisor who knew the PACT tasks and rubrics well with a new music education specialist from the Illinois College music department. Since the pair worked closely together as co-supervisors throughout the semester, they were asked to co-score the PACT submitted by the student teacher. The two decided to read and score the teacher performance assessment independently and then to meet together to discuss their ratings and come to a consensus for the score for each rubric based on the evidence provided in the form of artifacts and commentaries. Had disagreement and issues arisen concerning the teacher candidate's readiness for his/her own classroom, the PACT coordinator was prepared to double score the vocal music teaching event and, if necessary, seek a trained, independent scorer for this PACT Music TE. Involving a specialist from another department was a positive experience and a model that we hope to use again as we further engage our Illinois College colleagues from other disciplines with PACT implementation and preparation of highly skilled teacher candidates.

Both of the student teachers who were placed in the dual language elementary program in Beardstown worked in classrooms with bilingual mentor teachers where all teaching was done in Spanish. Supervisors with Spanish backgrounds were assigned to these candidates. As the student teachers, mentor teachers, and supervisors began planning and thinking about the PACT, questions such as these arose: Which Teaching Event should be used? Elementary Literacy/Math? Bi-lingual? How should the learning segment be constructed if one day's lesson is taught in Spanish and the next day's in English throughout the 3-5 days? Should the PACT task artifacts and commentaries be written in Spanish, English, or both? Ultimately, each candidate made different decisions in response to these questions.

The student teacher working in the kindergarten classroom chose to complete the Elementary Literacy TE. Her lesson plans were written in Spanish and English with all instruction in Spanish, including the video segment. All of the required task commentaries were submitted in English to facilitate valid and reliable scoring. The fifth grade teacher candidate also decided on an elementary TE, only she chose elementary math. While this preservice teacher wrote her entire teaching event in English, her context and situation posed the challenge of including five consecutive days of focused, connected math instruction, each day moving back and forth between the dual languages, Spanish and English. This proved to be an excellent learning experience for all involved. The teacher candidate challenged herself and successfully constructed and executed a learning segment that fit well in the dual language environment and from which all students learned. The Illinois College supervisor and PACT coordinator discovered the flexibility and adaptability of the PACT summative assessment component as candidates create a TE that best fits the context and content in which they teach.

All eight members of fall 2010 cohort passed the PACT, evidencing strengths with the planning, assessment, and reflection tasks. Task 3, Instruction, emerged as a weaker area for this cohort. All candidates scored at level 2, a passing score indicative of the candidate's readiness to be in charge of a classroom. Still, the scores suggested that the department should look specifically at the guiding questions, artifacts, commentaries, and rubrics of Task 3 to help determine if problems exist with candidate preparation and track the Task 3 scores of future candidates to determine if there is improvement. Possibly, greater candidate familiarity with the PACT testing process may have a positive

impact on scores in the future. It should be noted that all of these preservice teachers have been excellent students, strong teacher candidates, and campus leaders throughout their Illinois College careers.

Our experiences piloting and implementing the PACT Assessment System in the Teacher Preparation Program at Illinois College, thus far, had resulted in both individual and institutional learning and had engaged teacher educators and preservice candidates in thinking about what "highly qualified" and effective teacher candidates do need to know and be able to do in twenty-first century classrooms in a "rapidly changing world" (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) As the Illinois College education department prepared to build on its 2009-10 experience with the PACT implementation process, the formative component of the PACT Assessment System, Embedded Signature Assessments (ESAs) emerged as a focal point. Time to review and revise collaboratively course assignments that had potential to be used as ESAs and to develop new ones became our priority.

TPAC Prospective National TPA Model
As planning for the 2010-2011 academic year began, Illinois College received news that the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC), a national partnership of twenty states, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity(SCALE) had completed the design for a common initial licensing that could potentially be used nationally "to make preparation and licensing performance-based, as well as, predictive of teacher effectiveness." (Darling-Hammond, 2010) Architecturally, the TPAC TPA has roots in the National Board for Professional Teaching portfolio assessment for accomplished teachers, a model for both the Connecticut BEST assessment for teachers at the end of the induction phase and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). The PACT, a direct prototype for the new TPA, according to Darling-Hammond (2010):

 . . .has been shown to be reliable, valid, and a strong lever for improving both teacher competence and program quality. Like the Connecticut BEST assessment, a preliminary validity study of PACT also found that the teachers' scores on the assessment are positively associated with their value-added effectiveness when they later become full time teachers. Significantly, PACT, which is taken after California's basic skills and subject matter tests, does not seem to pose additional barriers for aspiring teachers of color. Early validation studies of PACT have found no disparities in the outcomes of the assessment by candidate race or ethnicity, in contrast to many other teacher tests that have greatly disparate pass rates that have often reduced the diversity of the teaching force.

The TPA, like its predecessors, is discipline specific, integrative in requiring candidates to pull together multiple skills to achieve a complex performance, and focused on the goal of improving student learning. Assessment of a preservice candidate's work is based on a set of analytic rubrics which afford clear and specific formative feedback for candidates and programs. Each candidate's work is assessed against 11 rubrics – 8 of which are task specific, and three of which focus on competencies that cut across tasks. It is important to note that the exercises and rubrics for each Task underscore candidates' abilities to attend to and build upon students' learning over the course of the learning segment, i.e., to teach so that all students can learn.

The required documentation of evidence in the TPA as a summative tool include a collection of records of practice: a set of standard tasks with a focus on a three to five day segment of meaningful instruction targeting the teacher candidate's competencies in planning, engagement (video of instruction), assessment, reflection, and academic language. The competencies assessed by the planning tasks and rubrics include candidate abilities to plan focused, sequenced instruction; to use his/her knowledge of his/her students to inform instruction; and to plan assessments that monitor and support student learning. In the area of instructional engagement (video), the expected proficiencies are the candidate's capabilities in engaging students in learning and in deepening student learning during instruction.

Evaluation of competence in assessment requires evidence of a candidate's expertise in analyzing student work, in the use of assessment to inform instruction, and in the use of feedback to guide student learning. Reflection and academic language are assessed throughout the learning segment. Through daily lesson and summative task reflection, the candidate must demonstrate his/her ability to monitor student progress and adjust instruction. Proficiencies in understanding language demands and resources and expanding students' academic language repertoire are measured as the academic language targets.

Again, like PACT, for each competency assessed, the TPAC TPA rubrics describe four levels of performance to determine that an individual preservice candidate has "learned to teach" and is ready to be the teacher of record in a twenty-first century classroom. Level 2 is considered sufficient for beginning teaching. Level 4 is written at a much more advanced level of proficiency—to attain a Level 4 rating candidates must be able to design and implement instruction that responds to and supports a range of learners' developmental strengths and needs. Just as the prototype for the TPA, the PACT, was subject to a variety of reliability and validity studies the results of which are available in a 2007 technical report published by the PACT design team at Stanford. As the pilot of the TPA developed by TPAC moves forward a parallel set of studies is planned. In addition, a predictive reliability study will be done (SCALE @Stanford University, 2010).

In the late summer of 2010, Kendyll Stansbury at Stanford's PACT Central, suggested that Illinois College consider transitioning from the parent assessment PACT to the TPA designed by the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium. Realizing through experience and learning the strengths of the PACT model, Illinois College's partnership with the PACT Consortium, the remarkable support available from PACT Central at Stanford, and considering Illinois College's historical commitment to leadership and service, the decision to become a spring 2011 pilot institution for a national performance assessment based on the National Board For Professional Teaching Standards portfolio, the Connecticut BEST assessment, and modeled on PACT was made. However, during the fall semester, the PACT would continue to be implemented with Illinois College teacher candidates, allowing time for the department to engage in fall activities related to implementation of the spring TPAC pilot. Moreover, another semester involved with PACT would be beneficial for education faculty members as the transition to the TPAC TPA began.

Illinois Institutional Partnerships and Piloting TPAC
As preparation for the TPAC assessment pilot got underway, Illinois College was invited to represent private Illinois teacher preparation institutions as part of a state team. This state team   would include teacher educators representing Illinois State University (a large public institution) and the University of Illinois, Chicago (a research institution), plus state officials, and other stakeholders in the process of awarding teacher credentials. The Illinois team communicated through monthly phone conferences, email, and a face-to-face meeting as plans for the TPAC TPA pilot progressed. In November many of the team members attended the 2010 PACT Implementation Conference in San Diego to learn more about relationships between PACT and its TPAC TPA offspring and the upcoming, large scale spring pilot.

Although a transition to the new TPA was on the horizon, the need to include ESA's, the formative component of the PACT Assessment System was not abandoned. With the support of the Illinois College dean, education faculty members met in January for a week-long assessment workshop. The major purpose was to review collaboratively and individually already embedded course assignments that had potential to be used as ESAs, revise them if necessary, and/or create new ones. At the end of the week, instructors had specific formative assessments ready to pilot in spring 2011 education courses. Imbedding these informative tools in education coursework would generate more "feedback data" useful in developing a true "culture of evidence" (Peck & McDonald, 2010) as efforts to improve the teacher preparation program and the development of highly skilled teacher candidates advanced.

The TPAC TPA Pilot at Illinois College
In January, 2011, the TPAC TPA pilot officially began. Thirty student teachers comprised the Illinois College pilot group. The majority of the cohort were early childhood (4) and elementary candidates (13). Others included secondary candidates in social studies/history (5), English/language arts (1), and specialist candidates in K-12 Spanish and K-12 physical education rounded out the group. The lower incidence areas of world languages (1) and physical education (3) were not in the official TPA pilot, but Stanford permitted Illinois College to "unofficially" pilot and collect data in those disciplines, as well.

This candidates piloting the TPAC TPA, unlike those involved with PACT, had not completed a guided TPAC performance assessment as part of their junior block experience in the spring of 2010. So, in that respect, these teacher candidates were similar to their peers who were involved in the TPAC TPA state and national pilot. Still, the Illinois College TPAC cohort participating in the TPA trial differed from other preservice candidates in some significant ways. Our teacher candidates were not recruited to engage in the TPAC pilot, nor was the level of expected performance downgraded because we were piloting a new assessment tool. Instead, participation in the TPA pilot was mandatory. Previous student teaching cohorts had completed the PACT which, after double or triple scoring, had included the development and implementation of remediation plans for teacher candidates who performed poorly on the assessment, failing specific tasks or the entire assessment and scoring at Level 1. Therefore, as we transitioned from PACT to the TPAC TPA, it was decided to continue to require all preservice candidates to complete successfully a performance assessment following the general implementation process utilized in prior semesters with the PACT (www.pacttpa.org; Sloan, T. & Merino, N., 2007)

Training, Scoring, and Candidate Remediation
As the spring pilot moved forward, supervisors and education department faculty soon recognized that although the PACT informed the TPAC TPA assessment design, definite differences existed in both the tasks delineated in the subject-specific handbooks for the candidates and in the language and expectations of the rubrics. The need for retraining and calibration as TPAC TPA scorers became apparent. In January, the Illinois College TPAC Coordinator, attended two, full day TPAC "Training of Trainers" workshops in Columbus, Ohio, with other teacher educators from the midwest, including faculty from Illinois State University and University of Illinois Chicago. Each trainer/scorer trainee could prepare to score and officially calibrate in only one of the subject specific areas to be piloted. After intensive, focused training and pending validated calibration by Stanford, the trainees would be qualified to train others at the institutional or state level to score the TPA for a specific content area.

To facilitate the scorer training process in all of the specific content areas included in the spring 2011 pilot at the various participating institutions of higher learning TPAC designed and provided effective online training for each elementary and secondary area to be piloted. Illinois College supervisors and education faculty members participated in both online training and on campus collaborative training sessions. By late April, the Illinois College scorers had calibrated and prepared to apply the TPAC rubrics to the performance assessments submitted by the spring student teaching cohort.

Initially, all Illinois College teacher candidates submitted TPAC TPAs in hard copy format to the TPAC coordinator using their TPAC ID numbers rather than names. With the help of the Office of Institutional Research, the TPAs for officially piloted content areas were randomly assigned to specific scorers so that no scorer would be assessing a teacher candidate whom he/she had supervised during the professional semester. Further, as required by TPAC, no scorer received his/her assigned candidate's(s') submission until that scorer had completed all components of the scorer training process and successfully calibrated as verified by the TPAC coordinator.

The four student teachers piloting in the areas of world languages and physical education followed the same submission procedures. However, because the college's supervisory team included only one specialist in each of these unofficial pilot areas and the candidate handbooks as well as the rubrics were still in the pre-pilot stage of development, the specialists were asked to score the work submitted by candidates whom they had supervised. To provide support and address bias and fairness, a physical education faculty member and the TPAC coordinator reviewed the scoring and discussed the ratings and evidence with the content specialists.

A two and a half week scoring window opened and closed in April as planned. As scorers returned the scored summative performance evaluations for their assigned candidates, two portfolios needed to be double scored by a scorer qualified to score them. In both cases, the results of the double scoring indicated that each of these candidates needed remediation in elements of Tasks 1 (Planning Instruction and Assessment) and Task 3 (Assessing Student Learning). Conferences with the TPAC coordinator, the teacher candidate, and the candidate's supervisor were held, assessment results and supporting evidence were discussed, specific feedback was exchanged, and individual remediation plans were developed. These two teacher candidates would revise to improve or redo the components of the Task(s) on which they had scored at Level 1. Each teacher candidate successfully executed his/her personal remediation plan supported by professional conferences with the TPAC coordinator as needed.

Two other teacher candidates failed all or almost all TPA portfolio Tasks with Level 1 ratings evidencing a need for more practice before he/she was ready for a classroom. One of these student teachers had a previously identified specific learning disability and an extended student teaching experience had already been planned for the other candidate. At the suggestion of the scorer, the TPAC coordinator scheduled a remediation conference with the special needs candidate. This provided the teacher candidate an opportunity to orally walk through his/her TPA making oral connections among tasks and artifacts, answering clarifying questions, and explaining the relationship among artifacts and written commentaries and the resources and materials utilized in the candidate's daily instruction. Using his/her strength in oral language to make his/her thinking visible assisted both the coordinator and the candidate in better understanding his/her TPA and in analyzing this student teacher's learning. The oral walk through and accompanying dialogue yielded the additional evidence necessary to move this teacher candidate beyond a Level 1 rating on all four TPA Tasks.

A team approach proved effective in the remediation of the student teacher with the extended professional semester. The TPAC coordinator, the Illinois College supervisor, the mentor teacher, and the teacher candidate worked collaboratively and cooperatively to institute a remediation plan for this student. The coordinator and the college supervisor met initially to discuss the needs of the candidate and the remediation that had already begun in the student teaching classroom, and to formulate a plan for continuing the corrective work with this candidate. Review of required formal lesson plans, direct observation of instruction, frequent targeted conferencing involving the classroom teacher and the supervisor, and candidate reflection and self-assessment successfully assisted us in validating this student teacher's independent performances on all TPAC tasks. Throughout this process the college supervisor met with the TPAC coordinator to report on conferences with the cooperating teacher and/or the student teacher, to share the next steps in their collective plan, and to discuss the candidate's progress and responses to the unified remediation effort. Choosing to apply this very individualized approach to resolve this candidate's deficiencies evidenced in both day to day classroom performance and performance assessment portfolio served the candidate well, assisting the candidate ultimately to demonstrate the confidence and competence necessary to be the teacher of record in his/her own twenty-first century classroom.

All of the remediation strategies employed during the TPAC TPA pilot effectively fostered institutional learning and promoted individual learning for all concerned. Further, the varied, individualized corrective measures used for remediation allowed teacher educators to apply the conceptual framework, "WHAT? SO WHAT? NOW WHAT?" (SCALE @ Stanford University, 2010-2011) of the TPAC Teacher Performance Assessment to the remediation process: *What*?–The scorer(s) assess an assigned candidate's performance portfolio and provides evidence from the artifacts and commentaries submitted by the student teacher to support rubric scores at a designated Level 1, 2, 3, or 4. The assigned portfolios and documented assessment results/scoring rubrics with evidence are returned to the TPAC coordinator for analysis. *So what*?–The TPA results are reviewed and analyzed by the TPAC coordinator and the scorer(s), as needed to determine if the scoring evidence for this assessment suggests that an individual teacher candidate is ready to be the "teacher of record" regarding core elements of effective teaching: "knowledge of students, research/theory, explanation of what happened in terms of student learning or how teaching affected student learning" (SCALE @ Stanford University, 2010), or if the TPA needs to be double and/or triple scored. *Now What*?--If the scoring data indicate that not enough evidence exists in the performance portfolio to verify a student teacher's classroom readiness and reflects a need for remediation, an individualized plan would be developed and implemented to offer the candidate more

practice and a chance to provide evidence that demonstrates success with all of the TPA Tasks. Alternatively, if the "feedback data" confirms that through this authentic portfolio assessment a candidate evidenced a readiness for his/her own classroom, then the candidate will be notified that he/she has received a passing score on his/her TPAC TPA. Further, a passing candidate's individual profile can be used to inform the candidate of areas of relative strength and challenges, as well as apprise teacher educators of individual, subgroup, and whole group information useful in impacting future practice.

What We Learned
Twenty-four teacher candidates who participated in the official TPAC Pilot completed the TPA in the areas of Elementary Literacy, Elementary Math, Language Arts, and Social Studies History. Five other candidates completed the TPAC in the areas of Physical Education and World Languages, and in Secondary Science (with a sixth grade class). The majority of these candidates scored at a level 2 overall. Planning tended to be the strongest area for Illinois College candidates; instruction, assessment, and academic language scores were weaker.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, candidates who struggled throughout the Illinois College teacher preparation program scored lower in most TPA areas than their peers. Those who scored 3's and 4's across tasks excelled throughout the program. Secondary social studies/history scores showed greater variance among candidates than those of the candidates in the elementary education group. However, the sample of five is small and one of these students who scored at Level 1 has special needs and another presented confidence issues which impacted both his/her performance on the TPA and in the student teaching classroom.

The data evidenced that most scorers, even those experienced with PACT, spent more than four hours in scoring each candidate. This is could be an area of concern and prompts the questions: How can scoring time be reduced? and/or Will a decrease in scoring time evolve naturally with more scoring experience? Scorer training with accompanying peer interaction and feedback is critical. Whether the scorer completes training with a trainer or online, providing opportunities for whole group, small group, and/or paired discussion and peer interaction during training is significant.

Our experience with the TPAC pilot confirmed the need for TPA training for cooperating teachers and administrators in the local and regional districts with whom we work. Developing and deepening their understanding of the TPA as a both a formative and summative evaluation tool and its role in the preparation and assessment of Illinois College teacher candidates during the student teaching semester is critical to the continuous improvement of the mentoring process. Highly effective local, regional, and institutional professional educators must work together proactively to foster the growth and development of novice teachers who enter the classroom as teachers who are not only highly qualified, but more importantly are "highly effective" in teaching for student learning. As we proceed with the field test, communicating with other professional educators/stakeholders will be essential to the successful implementation of the TPAC TPA during student teaching. Involving them in the undertaking is key.

This collaboration might be accomplished through professional development seminars, classes, and/or workshops at the school, district or regional levels. Dr. John Fritsche (Illinois College education department chair and director of teacher preparation in 2010-2011), Steve Breeze (retired regional superintendent), and Dr. Deborah Rust (superintendent and high school principal, Waverly, Illinois) are

leading an effort to connect regional districts with Illinois College for the purpose of professional development of regional faculties. In addition, as TPAC and Pearson proceed with the upcoming 2011-2012 TPA Field Test, the plan to recruit teachers and administrators as scorers would encourage our human resources in the classrooms of today to become true partners with Illinois College as we work to improve teacher preparation.

Reflecting on the semester long pilot experience and using the analysis of student work to inform our future practice, there is evidence to suggest a need for some specific changes:

1) The students who piloted the TPAC had little or no prior experience with this assessment. In the past as we worked with PACT, our students had experiences with the performance assessment tasks or Embedded Signature Assessments during the junior/secondary block semester. Expecting all of our candidates to engage in the TPAC TPA pilot without the guided experience provided during the PACT pilot created some attitude problems. The quantitative and qualitative pilot data collected at Illinois College indicate a need to reexamine the merits of our former practice.

2) This pilot group had difficulty in differentiating between student participation and student engagement. Additionally, monitoring student learning during instruction to deepen student thinking is an area where candidates need more practice. This red flag originally raised by the fall 2010 cohort bears attention and action.

3) Evidence from direct observations, personal interactions, emails, seminars, conferences with supervisors, meetings with candidates in small groups or individually, suggest that analysis of student work and predicting next steps for whole group, subgroups, and individuals that move beyond the generic/general/obvious were tasks candidates found difficult.

4) Most candidates showed a lack of understanding of academic language beyond content specific vocabulary. Some know and understand theoretically what academic language is, but struggle with real life applications in their own instructional practice when planning and assessing for student learning.

5) Examining both intra individual and inter individual profile data and the actual Teaching Events candidates submitted pinpoints overall challenges in aligning daily assessments with learning outcomes, in selecting and using a variety of formative assessments before, during, and after delivering instruction, and in utilizing formative assessments effectively in a segment of instruction to document and analyze student learning and inform practice.

6) Piloting a new assessment requires team work and flexibility with projected time lines and resources-especially when the ramping up of an electronic platform is involved. By the conclusion of the student teaching semester, thanks to a concerted effort by Stanford, Live Text, and our institutional technology experts, the teacher candidates were able to enter their TPA in Live Text and to securely upload the required video clip(s) for Task 3 from Google Docs to Live Text. Supervisors then accessed the assigned portfolios and entered all ofthe rubric scores and

recorded evidence from the hard copy format so that the Assessment Coordinator/Live Text administrator could prepare a TPAC TPA assessment report for the teacher preparation faculty and the dean of the College to review for the purpose of program improvement and course revision or redesign.

Conclusion

Transitioning from PACT to the TPAC TPA at Illinois College advanced individual learning for preservice candidates, supervisors, and education department faculty members. Rich opportunities for collective and personal professional growth for all stakeholders emerged as a natural consequence of the TPAC TPA pilot experiences. Our earlier partnership with the PACT Consortium provided a solid foundation on which to build as we moved forward in our efforts to improve teacher education programs at Illinois College. Moreover, our history with PACT assessment system and our membership in the California consortium proved beneficial in encouraging meaningful, ongoing education faculty collaboration. Because department faculty were already familiar with the dual purposes of the PACT assessment system--the prototype for the TPAC TPA--the need to focus on the anticipated formative potential of the new assessment system surfaced as the spring pilot semester approached. While most of the institutions of higher education participating in the national pilot concentrated on acquiring the knowledge and understanding necessary to try out the summative evaluation, Illinois College teacher educators worked collegially to review, revise, and/or design formative assessments or embedded signature assessments (ESAs), to be tested in 200 and 300 level preservice courses during the spring 2011 semester. Along with the summative data from the national TPA trials, the available formative data from the ESA experiment should permit us, as professional teacher educators, to apply to our own practice and programs the proposition on which the TPAC TPA is based: ". . . successful teaching is based on knowledge of subject matter and subject-specific pedagogy, developing knowledge of one's students, reflecting and acting on evidence of the effects of instruction on student learning, and considering research/theory about how students learn. " (from candidate handbook, TPAC Assessment Elementary Mathematics 2011. Scale@Stanford University).

Grounded in and informed by a strong lineage, the Teacher Performance Assessment developed by the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium the Illinois College teacher educators feel prepared to lead and serve not only our teacher candidates, but a society in need of assurance that new teachers, as Darling-Hammond proposes, enter the profession with the "sophisticated abilities to teach more complex curriculum to the growing number of public school students who have fewer educational resources at home, those who are new English language learners, and those who have distinctive learning needs." (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 1) We look forward to participating the national TPAC TPA field test and to continuing to grow and develop professionally through true collaboration and informative assessment as we work to help transform teacher preparation to meet the expectations of an ever changing domestic and global community; helping all students to succeed in learning and reaching high standards.

References

Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should know and be able to do*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010) *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching*. A report for The Center for American Progress.

Peck, C. & McDonald, M. (2009) "Using PACT for Focused Improvement of Teacher Education Programs," unpublished PowerPoint presentation, PACT Implementation Conference.

Peck, C. & McDonald, M. (2010). "Creating 'cultures of evidence' in teacher education: Context, policy and practice in three high data use programs." A report submitted to the Agency for Education Development.

Pecheone, R. L. and Chung, R. R. (January/February 2006). Evidence in teacher education: The performance assessment for California teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education,* 57(1), 22-36.

Rothman, R. (July/August, 2008). Taking the Measure of New Teachers: California shifts from standardized tests to performance-based assessment as a condition of licensure. *Harvard Education Letter*, V24(1), 1-3.

Sloan, T. & Merino, N. (Last updated 2011). Performance assessment for California teachers implementation handbook. www.pacttpa.org

Wei, R. & Pecheone, R. (2010). Assessment for learning in preservice teacher education: Performance based assessments. In Kennedy, M. M. (ed.). *Teacher assessment and the quest for teacher quality: A handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

The Development of a Co-Teaching Model for the Preparation of Teachers at Millikin University *by Nancy Gaylen, Ph.D.*

Author Bio: Nancy I. Gaylen, Ph.D. is associate professor and director of the school of education at Millikin Univesity. She began her career as a public school teacher in Florida. Her current interests range from program assessment and urban school reform to international teacher exchanges in China, Spain, and Chile. She may be contacted at ngaylen@millikin.edu.

Abstract
This article describes a four-year project, supported through an Innovations grant from the Center for Success in High-Need Schools at the Associated Colleges of Illinois,   to implement co-teaching as a standard feature of the teacher preparation program at Millikin University.   The article reviews the research on co-teaching as a guide in developing such programs and analyzes Millikin's experience in transferring co-teaching as a model designed for collaboration between general education and special education teachers to the arena of student teaching and partnership with cooperating teachers.

Introduction
In addition to describing the development of Millikin University's co-teaching program, this article addresses two questions:
1. What does the research literature reveal that may be helpful in designing a co-teaching program to improve the student teaching experience?
2. How can we transfer the positives and negatives of co-teaching models developed for general education and special education teachers to a different collaborative arena: that of the student teacher and cooperating teacher partnership?

Co-teaching for student teaching is necessary in preparing effective teachers for today′s classrooms. All general education teachers in inclusive classrooms need to be competent in working with various other teachers who are providing services to many different learners in today′s classrooms. If a teacher candidate learns how to co-teach during their semester of student teaching, they will be better prepared as beginning teachers to work with the variety of educational specialists working in today′s classrooms.

Literature Review
In the past, the co-teaching model has only been used in collaborations between general education teachers and special education teachers. Both are prepared in specific content and each brings different skills and knowledge to the classroom. Schools have restructured how children with learning differences receive instruction from special educators. Students no longer move out of the classroom, rather special educators move with their students into the general education environment. This shift created a need for collaborative teaching that has been referred to as collaborative consultation and co-teaching (Weiss and Lloyd, 2003).

Zigmond and Magiera (2001) explain that the major goals of co-teaching and collaboration involve increasing access to a wider range of instructional options for students with disabilities, enhancing the participation of students with disabilities within general education classes, and improving the performance of students with disabilities.

Although many co-teaching programs have been developed, research continues to show an inadequate knowledge base to measure both co-teaching's overall effectiveness and the most effective model. General education teachers and special education teachers still do not have a reliable research base to guide their co-teaching efforts. In *Current Practice Alert*, a quarterly publication sponsored by the Division for Learning Disabilities and the Division for Research of the Council for Exceptional Children (Issue 6, 2001), authors caution, ″If the goal is to achieve greater academic gains than have been traditionally achieved in a resource program, then co-teaching has not yet proved itself useful. Furthermore, the research suggests that the prevailing assumptions about the effectiveness and usefulness of co-teaching for students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms need to be reexamined.″

If co-teaching can be used as a model for student teaching, it will rely not only on the positive results of co-teaching that have been tried and developed by general education and special education teachers, but also add key elements of effective preservice candidate preparation.   For example, in the article, ″Conditions for Co-Teaching: Lessons from a Case Study,″ published in 2003, Weiss and Lloyd identify positive attributes of two teachers working together. Teachers planned together, settled differences together, and instructed together for varying portions of the school day. These teachers monitored their instruction and adapted to individual student needs. Earlier research by Cook and Friend published in 1998 addressed conditions they found   necessary for success. They identified professional preparation, administrative support, collaborative planning, instructional strategies and methods for joint teaching and opportunities for further development in communication skills as key elements. Zigmond and Magiera (2001) also noted that positive perceptions of co-teaching required administrative support and added that additional planning time, similar collaborating teacher beliefs about teaching, and mutual respect of one another are critical.

Schools of education desiring to prepare general education teachers for today′s classroom need to make co-teaching an integral part of candidate course work and internship experiences leading up to and through the semester of student teaching. One of the biggest challenges of such an endeavor will be to build a positive working relationship between a cooperating mentor teacher and the candidate who is not yet certified. ″The Co-Teaching Relationship Scale: Applications for Professional Development″ (Noonan, et al, 2003), is a useful source for teacher candidates in measuring compatibility with their cooperating mentor teachers. According to Noonan, the co-teacher relationship is defined by the extent of perceived similarities in beliefs, personal characteristics and traits, and professional style between the candidate and the cooperating teacher. How co-teachers relate to one another influences significantly what they do in the classroom and whether the collaboration survives.

It would be very beneficial for teacher candidates and cooperating mentor teachers to complete the compatibility questionnaire Noonan and associates (2003) developed and analyze the results. This questionnaire is designed to rate how co-teaching pairs relate to one another. There are three categories: personality traits, beliefs and approaches to teaching and personal/professional characteristics. The questionnaire could be administered at a pre-student teaching workshop to promote discussion about the importance of creating and maintaining strong collaborative relationships. Co-teaching pairs could also analyze individual items on the questionnaire to see where their approaches or beliefs are similar, where they differ widely and what they might do to overcome differences in order to co-teach effectively.

Believing that two people will be sufficiently compatible to come together naturally as a successful working team able to teach a classroom of students for a semester of student teaching is a questionable

assumption. It may be too much to expect that even a seasoned classroom teacher mentor and a teacher candidate preparing to student teach will have well-developed teaming and perceptive, intuitive communication skills. The developers of the CRS (Co-Teacher Relationship Scale) found that the need for staff development is mentioned repeatedly in literature about co-teaching. Noonan, et al, also suggest that cultural differences between master teacher and candidate may have significant effect on ease of communication. To remedy these challenges, they recommend focusing on building common ground around perceived similarities identified in the CRS.

It is interesting to note that after field testing the CRS, the authors observed, "Early Childhood Educators and Special Educators held very similar views as to practices that are important when working with young children and their families. Professionals from the two fields have greater concurrence in what they believe to be recommended practices than they do divergence." Early childhood and special education program professors should take note and use similar strategies whether to prepare teachers and early childhood interventionists to work with children and families of diverse cultures, or to prepare teacher candidates and cooperating mentor teachers to co-teach together for student teaching.

Following the caution in *Current Practice Alerts* (2001) that co-teaching had not proven to in crease student learning, Nancy Bacharach, Teresa Washut Heck, and Kathryn Dahlberg set out with support of a five-year Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant to prove conclusively that co-teaching does improve student learning, as demonstrated through student standardized test scores. They published their results in the Spring, 2010 issue of *Action in Teacher Education*, documenting that co-teaching, indeed, can lead to student gains in learning. in designing their study, the St. Cloud researchers studied the findings of Roth and Tobin who suggest that co-teaching, or teaching at another teacher's elbow, assists student teachers to become better teachers (Roth and Tobin, 2004). Roth and Tobin's study, however, lacked empirical effectiveness measures and data on the impacts of co-teaching. Bacharach et al set out to compare and contrast co-teaching to a non-co-teaching model of student teaching. They defined co-teaching as two teachers (a cooperating teacher and a teacher candidate) working together with groups of students--sharing the planning, organization, delivery and assessment of instruction, as well as the physical space. Collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, they compared preparation, introduction, involvement, relationship building, communication and collaboration, planning, solo vs. lead, modeling and coaching, and the power differential. Comparing P-12 student test scores revealed that co-teaching classrooms yielded higher scores than non co-teaching classrooms in the study. The qualitative evidence supported the use of co-teaching as well. Student focus group feedback indicated that co-teaching is a positive experience for students, providing increased opportunities for engagement and additional and timely support in meeting their individual learning needs (Bacharach et al, 2010).

The Co-Teaching Story at Millikin University
Millikin University's School of Education became involved in co-teaching with support from St. Cloud University in the dissemination of its TQE grant results. Earlier the School of Education had developed goals for improving the student teaching semester. One was making earlier arrangements for student teacher placements in the face of seeming school district resistance to taking student teachers. We discovered that field directors across the country were experiencing increasing difficulty in securing high-quality student teaching placements (Ellis and Bogle, 2008). With the pressure of No Child Left Behind federal requirements for annual yearly progress in children's standardized test scores, building principals were becoming reluctant to allow a student teacher to take full control of teaching

responsibilities while the teacher of record stepped aside or stepped out of the classroom. Milikin needed to adopt an innovative and ground breaking model of student teaching that would increase principal confidence that test scores would continue to progress.

Independent of school principal concerns, Millikin's teacher education faculty had concluded for academic reasons that they needed to create a more meaningful and powerful student teaching experience for our teacher candidates. The complexity of classroom teaching has grown exponentially in recent years; teacher candidates were becoming quickly overwhelmed in student teaching. They were unable to emulate best practice if they were only able to observe their cooperating teacher. Other strategies of apprenticeship needed to be developed that would include more cooperative planning, cooperative teaching, and opportunities for honest, open and effective communication.

When we learned of the St. Cloud co-teaching program we immediately saw an opportunity to demonstrate how two teachers teaching side by side in the classroom could be significantly beneficial to children's learning qualitatively as well as quantitatively. We felt that if we could show the benefit of co-teaching in the learning of children districts would request co-teaching for student teaching over the traditional style of student teaching and recognize the value added by hosting a teacher candidate using the co-teaching model.   Our director of teacher placement attended St. Cloud University's research presentation on the results of co-teaching at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators in San Diego in 2007.   Still in its infancy, Bacharach et al explained that they also used the co-teaching model to persuade school districts to place St. Cloud student teachers.   This would be possible only through presentation of data regarding the effectiveness of co-teaching (Bacharach et al, 2010). We requested to become one of St. Cloud's TQE dissemination sites and were invited to a St. Cloud train the trainers workshop in Minneapolis to equip our field placement director to conduct a co-teaching "pairs workshop" and hold one-on-one informational meetings with superintendents, followed by meetings with building principals and their teaching staffs. The St. Cloud team also came to our university campus to model our initial workshops with cooperating teachers and teacher candidates. We learned how positive communication relationships can be built between veteran mentors and young adults preparing to begin their professional teaching careers.

In launching our co-teaching model of student teaching at Millikin, we started with two elementary schools within our local urban school district. We began with five "pairs" (one cooperating teacher and one teacher candidate) at each elementary school and assigned one university supervisor to each school building. The one-day "Pairs Workshop" was held in early January, 2008. Millikin University paid for workshop facilitators, materials, and meals through   an Innovations Grant from The Center for High-Need Schools of the Associated Colleges of Illinois. As the student teaching semester started, it was the university supervisor's responsibility to assure the following steps were implemented, monitored and supported for quality and accuracy:
▢ Pairs were given release time of one hour   per week to co-plan, in addition to other required instructional planning.
▢ Pairs were required to plan and teach lessons where they employed one of seven strategies of co-teaching such as "one teach-one observe," "one teach-one drift,", "station teaching," "parallel teaching," "supplemental teaching," plus differentiated instruction and team teaching.

⬜ Teacher candidates were required to keep reflective journals where they could analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of their co-teaching strategies.

University supervisors were required to meet with the pairs to discuss progress of the three action steps and manage any conflicts or difficulties in communication or collaboration.

One of the biggest lessons we learned when first helping cooperating teachers become co- teachers with teacher candidates is that without routine and frequent visits from the university supervisor, teachers fall back on old habits. At one point in a semester, one university supervisor found, having not visited for a couple of weeks, that all the cooperating teachers had decided collectively to leave their classrooms and let teacher candidates "sink or swim" on their own because that was done to them when they had student taught. They believed that teacher candidates needed to feel what this experience was like. The university supervisor explained to the cooperating teachers that the goal of co-teaching is to improve instruction through employing teaching strategies that differentiate instruction for all children in a classroom. Co-teaching takes more time to plan how best to teach a concept, how best to practice a skill, and how best to have children demonstrate their understanding. Successful co-teaching required continual communication and analysis of best practices, as well as thoughtful self-reflection. Co-teaching was hard work but beneficial to children, teacher candidates and cooperating teachers.

Having five teaching pairs per building proved very beneficial. University supervisors had only to travel to one building, could remain for an entire day, observe lessons, and facilitate co-planning meetings, and conference one-on-one or in teams. The five pairs could also form support groups. Teacher candidates had peers to talk with and cooperating teachers had a cohort group with which to compare notes and discuss challenging situations. The field director assisted the university supervisors in reading and responding to reflective journals and teaching observation notes, as well as assisting in problem-solving regarding conflicts and setbacks.

At the end of the semester, the field director held an evaluation and celebration event. All student teachers and their cooperating teachers attended. This gave us very helpful feedback in comparing the experiences and effectiveness of co-teaching pairs vs. teacher candidates who student taught in the "traditional" style. In developing the Millikin co-teaching model, we knew we would need to situate those who had co-taught with those who had not in a relaxed, supportive environment. We also needed to have the two groups engage in substantive discussions about their student teaching experiences. This strategy enabled us to present co-teaching to other teachers much more persuasively than having our field director simply call up the school district and say, "We're doing this and would like to implement it in your school." Teachers heard from each other about the benefits of co-teaching as well as the challenges. For the teacher, the uninterrupted time in their classroom with their children and having a teacher candidate present   to teach actively and purposefully for the entire semester was the biggest positive change. An incredulous traditional student teacher   comment to a co-teaching peer during a focus group discussion expressed succinctly what may be the biggest difference in the experiences between co-teaching and traditional student teaching, "…..like….you **talked** to your coop?!?" Teacher candidates who had co-taught matured significantly in their preparation to be teachers of record. They had learned to behave like professional colleagues, to articulate how they collaborated with their cooperating teacher, and to speak knowledgably about how they approached student learning.

Adapting co-teaching strategies in elementary classrooms was came naturally for classroom teachers, especially those that readily saw the benefits for their children. Our numbers of teachers who came to informational workshops has grown rapidly. After several years, we had cooperating teachers in most of our regional districts that had either been to an informational meeting and had co-taught, or were ready to attend their first pairs workshop with their teacher candidate and try co-teaching for the first time. Word of mouth worked to our advantage. We set a goal to have all teacher candidates co-teach. Wherever possible, we matched teacher candidates with teachers who had already co-taught or matched them with someone who was eager to learn and become part of our initiative.

Observing our success at the elementary level, high school teachers gradually and somewhat grudgingly became involved in our co-teaching initiative. They were not as quick to embrace the philosophy of co-teaching. Because methods of instruction in many high school classrooms are not as varied as in elementary classrooms, co-teaching strategies were less familiar to high school teachers. The opportunities for teacher candidates pursuing secondary certification who desired to try co-teaching were fewer. Our field director had to recruit high quality high school teachers actively and tell them in detail about the instructional benefits of co-teaching. One math teacher and one English teacher became our model co-teachers. We videotaped excellent lessons being co-taught by the pairs. We produced a DVD and used it at informational meetings for middle and high school teachers.

Results
After five years, we have reached a point where teacher candidates no longer say to each other, "what kind of student teaching are you going to do, co-teaching or regular?" If at all possible, most candidates are placed in co-teaching situations for student teaching. When our field director begins the process of placing student teachers in buildings, she discovers where co-teaching mentors are located; if middle or high school, what subject areas they teach. If they have not attended a co-teaching informational meeting, she invites them personally. We are also going to school buildings for informational meetings and pairs workshops instead of scheduling all meetings and workshops on campus.

Co-Teaching is now imbedded in all facets and stages of our teacher preparation programs. Teacher candidates are introduced to some of the seven strategies of co-teaching during their sophomore block internship and coursework. More co-teaching strategies are learned during the junior block internship and courses. "Blocks" are co-requisite groups of classes candidates enroll in during their sophomore and junior years. They are also engaged in internships within their courses. To assist teacher candidates in learning to co-teach, professors and cooperating teachers model the seven co-teaching strategies in the candidates' early internships. Teacher candidates also practice strategies during the early internships, reflect on the lessons they teach, and analyze their effectiveness in co-teachering. By the time they are ready to apply to student teach during their senior year, they assume that they will be co-teaching with their cooperating teacher. During the semester prior to student teaching, teacher candidates are interning for 60 hours with their cooperating teachers and must co-teach at least one lesson with the university supervisor who supervises them through their entire senior yea present.

The four-year process of imbedding co-teaching in Millikin's teacher education programs has been a challenging yet rewarding endeavor. We feel comfortable that co-teaching is an integral part of our programs, not a simple "add-on." Districts are now requesting candidates from our program because they know that co-teaching is part of the skill set that our candidates bring to P-12 classrooms, at all levels of internships. Building principals and teachers alike agree that the biggest benefit of co-teaching

is having two teachers in the classroom at all times. Two teachers, co-teaching, lowers the teacher to student ratio and provides more differentiated instruction to all children, as well as more opportunities for instructional interventions. Other universities have begun to request us to offer informational meetings and workshops on co-teaching, so that they will be able to implement these strategies with their candidates. As a result, we have begun informally to help to disseminate good practices in co-teaching, the work that St. Cloud University started.

References

"Current Practice Alerts: A Focus on Co-Teaching: Use Caution"; Sponsored by the Division for Learning Disabilities and Division for Research of the Council for Exceptional Children; issue 6, Autumn 2001.

"Case Studies in Co-Teaching in the Content Areas: Successes, Failures and Challenges" by Margo A. Mastropieri, Thomas E. Scruggs, Janet Graetz, Jennifer Norland, Walena Gardizi, and Kimberly McDuffie; *Intervention in School and Clinic* volume # 40 no. 5, May 2005.

"Conditions for Co-Teaching: Lessons from a Case Study" by Margaret P.Weiss and John Lloyd; *Teacher Education and Special Education,* volume 26, #1, Winter 2003.

"The Co-Teacher Relationship Scale: Applications for Professional Development" by Mary Jo Noonan, Linda McCormick, and Ronald H. Heck; *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, volume 38, #1, March 2003.

"Changing the Face of Student Teaching Through Co-Teaching" by Nancy Bacharach, Teresa Washut Heck, Kathryn Dahlberg; *Action in Teacher Education*, volume 32, #1, Spring 2010.

Show AND Tell: Using Simulation to Help Teacher Candidates Deepen Understanding of English Language Learning Students *by Desiree H. Pointer Mace, Ph.D.*

Author Bio: Desiree H. Pointer Mace, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor and Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, School of Education,   Alverno College.   She can be reached at
desiree.pointer-mace@alverno.edu

Abstract
This article describes a simulation experience embedded in an introductory education course at Alverno College in Milwaukee, WI.   The Spanish-language immersion experience allows teacher education students to scaffold and extend their understanding of how English language learning students experience school, and helps candidates identify and articulate goals for how best to serve linguistically diverse student populations.

Introduction
Educators who prepare future teachers know that it is impossible to learn to teach by observation and reading alone; throughout teacher education programs students experience developmental field-based coursework intended to help them build strategies for teaching. But how do we support candidates in careful interrogation of long-held assumptions, or open windows into other life experiences? How do we help teachers learn to serve increasingly diverse classrooms and deepen their moral commitments to support all learners?

In this article, I will describe how I have worked within the context of a field-based foundational course to develop a second language learning simulation for my students at Alverno College (Milwaukee, WI). Alverno has long emphasized performance- and outcome-based assessment (Mentkowski, 2000; Loacker and Rogers, 2005; Alverno College Faculty, 1994) and my context greatly informs my practice.   The simulation requires my students not only to learn successful strategies for conveying content to students in a second language, but to help them identify and uncover some moral issues involved in serving English language learning students.   I can tell them through planned lectures and readings about these issues, or I can take them with me on an experiential journey.   I prefer the latter.

My Teaching Path
I began my teaching career as a Spanish bilingual teacher in Oakland, California.   Oakland Unified is a large, linguistically and ethnically diverse, high poverty, urban district with many of the same challenges and opportunities for teaching that other large urban contexts present. My school was predominantly native English speaking and African-American, my classroom predominantly native Spanish speaking and Latino/a; the peer and school language was English, and I struggled with how to develop my students' biliteracy and bilingualism when, to them, that advocacy stopped outside my classroom door.

In research I have done on linguistically diverse schools and classrooms, I have found that teachers face similar challenges and share similar concerns. I studied a Spanish immersion school in which by fifth grade, native English speakers' academic assessments far surpassed the native Spanish speakers', even on Spanish language tasks (Pointer, 1996). Much public display was made of the native English speakers' performance in a non-native language, and relatively little of the native Spanish speakers'

gradual loss of their native language.   In a school that aimed at full biliteracy and bilingualism for all students, only the native English speakers were achieving academic success.

At another elementary school in the same district (Pointer, 1997), the outcomes were very different. In that class, social relationships in the classroom occurred through and across language(s).   The students and the teacher did not have fixed ways of using their two languages; rather, their language use differed across situations.   The teacher set the tone for this celebration of students' language diversity.   She encouraged language play through song, rhyme, and explicit language instruction.   The students responded to her linguistic example by internalizing many of the strategies she gave them and using them in their peer interactions.   Language play was used to cross borders, and to extend linguistic knowledge.   Translation was used to assist peer understanding, and to process one's own understanding.   The students and the teacher created a classroom in which full use of two languages not only brought about academic success, but provided an incentive to develop and maintain friendships.

A third study (Pointer Mace, 2009) incorporated the use of multimedia to document the rich tapestry of language and culture in an English-instruction classroom. In that context, despite the teacher's monolingualism, she worked with her students to establish community norms that supported students' home language expression, required students to present cultural inquiry projects connected to the diverse school community, and showed a deep commitment to her students' multicultural identities. Her students saw and understood this commitment and were able to connect it to their own sense of engagement; their parents did as well.

Thus, these investigations showed me that the constructed notions of what language diversity meant in all of these settings are radically different, and that in each of these programs students developed different ideas about who they "are" in both languages. Crucially, it was the teacher who made the difference in what students learned, the understandings they developed from their experiences in each language, and the impact of these experiences on their cultural identity and sense of self.

English language learning students are able to detect underlying messages about their languages' worth−and their own worth −that are conveyed by their teachers and their schools through the priorities placed on language acquisition in programs for English language learning students.   Student reactions to these underlying messages then get articulated into their constructions of who they are vis a vis language, culture, power, and school.   Future teachers, the vast majority of whom are not native speakers of languages other than English (Feistritzer, 2005), may not have any sense of what everyday life feels like lived in a second language. It is imperative that teacher educators help their future teacher candidates to develop this understanding.

Language Acquisition in Social Context
In order to best support English language learning students, teachers must be aware of the interpersonal dynamics that undergird language acquisition. Discussions of language development cannot be separated from those of sociocultural development.   Children learn to tailor their speech to the different social worlds (Dyson, 1993) in which they engage. Teachers introduce classroom patterns and routines that facilitate the child's language learning and impart socializing values (Peters and Boggs, 1986; Vasquez, Pease-Alvarez and Shannon, 1994).
In many such programs, the main provider of target language input in the second language is the teacher, who is also responsible for conveying academic knowledge (Fillmore, 1985).   The teacher shapes the

medium, the message, and the mode of expression of the message.   Her choices about the language of instruction convey "underlying messages" to children about language itself and "the nature of social relationships" (Eisenberg, 1986, 191; Ochs, 1988).   If a teacher in a bilingual classroom places strong emphasis on one language over the other, the students' opportunities to speak in the less-emphasized language will diminish accordingly.   Dynamics of the surrounding environment that then emerge include the characteristics of the program into which the student is placed; the other children whose peer interactions are an important aspect of language learning; the functions of languages as they are used in the realm of the school; how children respond to those dynamics; and the consequences of that response on their further cognitive, social, linguistic, and intrapersonal development (Rogoff, 1990).

Teachers in multilingual classrooms, in addition to all the requirements demanded of teachers of native English speakers, have the challenge of validating (and developing, if the teacher herself is bilingual) the native languages of her students, while ensuring their acquisition of English.   The efforts of one teacher over one year are only responsible for a fraction of this linguistic development: the average ELL student "takes between six and seven years to approach grade norms in English academic skills" (Cummins, 1981, 9) and many ELL students never acquire full English proficiency (Fillmore, 1992).

Teachers should work, therefore, to examine critically their efforts to reinforce the native language and the cultural identity of their students (Cummins, 1981; Vasquez et al, 1994; Edelsky & Hudelson, 1980).   Teachers should incorporate diverse strategies, learning as much as they can about students' lives outside of school.   Outreach to parents is vital: what parents construe as "learning" may overlap only slightly with the teacher's measurements. Therefore, teachers must look to the "means by which children achieve a shared understanding with those who serve as their guides and companions through explanation, discussion, provision of expert models, joint participation, active observation, and arrangement of children's roles" (Rogoff, 1990, 8) to discover the "multiple and varied modes of bilingual and multicultural activity practiced by students, their families, and members of their communities" (Vasquez, 1994, 109).   Exploring how bilingualism is constructed and enacted in the classroom can yield the evidence teachers need of the success of their efforts.

Such collaboration can give rise to a "recognition perspective" for school policy in which "the full range of minority children's experiences (are) thought of as a resource for learning in schools, rather than as an impediment" (Vasquez et al, 1994, 150; Ferdman, 1990). How can we prepare teacher candidates to develop a recognition perspective? I assert that teacher educators can do this by helping candidates see for themselves what classroom life is like for English language learners.

A Simulation Experience of Second Language Learning
In my teaching, I strive to model that "recognition perspective" in a simulation intended to develop my students' understanding of English language learners' school experiences.   My course, ED 201, is the first field experience course that Alverno students interested in becoming teachers take, whether they're preparing to teach in early childhood, elementary-middle, or secondary education. In that course, I work to help novices examine what they think they know about teaching from over a dozen years of being a student and to move from that examination to a critical consideration of the ways in which theory and practice continually combine in the everyday work of teaching. I introduce the beginning education students to the Wisconsin Teaching Standards (identical to INTASC), the Alverno Advanced Abilities for Education Majors (Diez, 1988), and foundational ideas about practice.   Students spend three hours a week in my class and two hours a week in upper-elementary-grade field observations at nearby

Milwaukee public schools. The course is a seminar in scope and focus—enrollment is capped at 20 students.

Classroom Context
I am a firm believer in student-centered education and I teach from that commitment. It matters to me to know my students so that I can support them as learners.   I work in the first several sessions to build that understanding and trust among all the class members. About half-way through the semester, I have established enough encomie with my students to be able to structure a learning experience intended to put them in an uncomfortable place—that of the second language learning students. While Alverno is a remarkably diverse institution (72% of our students are first-generation college students; 45% are women of color), even students who come from a home where languages other than English are spoken have not often had a chance to develop that capacity fully.   What to do? Surprise them!

The day of the simulation, my students come to class and find that I have decorated our college classroom like my own Spanish bilingual classroom—posters on the wall with colors ("Los Colores"), sizes ("Tamaño"), and facial expressions/ feelings ("Los Sentimientos").   I have checked out dozens of Spanish language children's books and have them collected in an open area of the room set up for "readaloud";   a Spanish translation of Maurice Sendak's "Where the Wild Things Are" (1963) is prominently displayed.   Two table groups are set up for a math center and a writing center. The math center has a scale, unifix cubes, playdough, paper plates, and a poster sharing visuals and instructions   for building a "Wild Thing," measuring it, weighing it, and plotting it on a graph. The writing center has a poster modeling the day's writing assignment—a prompt for them to draw a "Wild Thing" and then describe it in short sentences (e.g. "Mi monstruo es azul.").

The Simulation Experience
I greet the students animatedly and positively in Spanish, telling them with my words and gestures to come sit down in a circle in the readaloud area.   Many of the students giggle or say to each other "What?" but they make their way to the circle.   For the next hour and a half, I exclusively speak to them in Spanish. Some students understand some of what I'm saying, having studied a year or two of Spanish in high school; others may have spoken Spanish natively and find themselves translating for their peers.

Opening
Community circle and readaloud of "Where The Wild Things Are." I begin with a community circle, asking each student to say her name and how she's feeling today, giving the prompt "Mi nombre es... y me siento..."   Students respond, consulting the poster on the wall showing facial expressions.   I then read Sendak's book to them, my voice "ROOOOAAAAARRRRing," glaring my "terrible eyes" and showing my "terrible claws" as the narrative unfolds.   At times, I stop the reading and ask students fairly low-order thinking questions: how many monsters/ wild things they see, how each monster or Max might be feeling, where Max is (in the forest? in a boat?). I vociferously and animatedly praise students' responses, striving to have students engage with the content in Spanish.

Small group work
After the readaloud, I explain with gestures, words and visuals the tasks to be completed in the small group stations.   My intent in having them do the small group tasks is to increase the level of cognitive demand on them. Over the next 30 minutes, students work on writing and illustrating a short piece

about their "monstruo," then build a playdough monster, weigh it, measure it, and plot it on a graph.   Meanwhile, bright and cheerful Spanish-language music plays and I circulate between the groups, asking questions and praising student efforts.

Whole group circle
Once their sculptures and stories have been completed and added to the classroom "gallery" along one wall, I invite students back to the readaloud area.   We settle in, and I review with them the graph they created, identifying that as the monsters got taller (or wider), their weight increases. I ask students to make a hypothesis about why this is—almost always, no one responds.   I then say, "How about we switch back into English?" Every student in the classroom audibly sighs with relief. That sigh, that relaxation of my students' shoulders, is exactly why I have the students participate in this simulation. They cannot understand until they experience it for themselves how intellectually, emotionally, and physically involving it is to strive to succeed in a second language learning environment.

Reflection on the simulation
I then invite students to take some quiet think time, identifying connections between the reading they had done before coming to class and how they experienced the simulation. What did I do to support their understandings? What strategies did they use? What role did the learning environment, posters, and hands-on materials play? And most importantly, what moral or ethical issues can they identify in this experience for teachers preparing to serve linguistically diverse student populations?

Debriefing the Experience
After students have had some time to reflect and write, I ask them to share their insights with each other.   They speak to common themes that identify opportunities for teachers with English language learning populations: using multiple modes of communication and assessment, showing positive dispositions toward students, cultivating constructive peer support, recognizing that students are coping with frustration, and setting clear goals for better serving student needs. Their voices attest to the impact of the simulation on their development as future teachers.

Strategies to support learning
In commenting on what they learned in the simulation students clearly identified strategies I used to support their learning.   Some examples of these responses:

Desiree's lesson on ESL engagement certainly had a direct connection to the reading in that she chose to immerse us in the language using various visuals and supports to encourage our connection to the lesson and the language.   Current trends confirm that best practice for second language instruction includes teaching language as a "whole, interrelated system" as opposed to "isolated units of language." The focus is on building meaning and context to allow language to emerge "holistically."   Desiree's lesson provided multiple opportunities for the "natural emergence" of "functional language" through repeating phrases she shared and adding our own personal components.   She also incorporated opportunities to repeat "chunks" of language more frequently used such as *me llamo* and *sentimentos*, some of which would be familiar to those with almost any Spanish exposure.   Interesting to note was that students who   were more comfortable participating early on helped to encourage those of us who were less participating. We were able to start small with repeating simple words, and eventually most everyone had success with longer phrases and

sentences as well. This in addition to the visuals aided in building true comprehension of what we were saying.

Desiree helped me understand the language by offering many facial expressions, change of tone, and many supportive pictures and pieces of evidence around the classroom. [By her] Pointing to objects and showing examples I was able to understand   what actions I needed to also do. As Desiree read the book I didn't understand most words in Spanish, although I was able to follow her tone of voice and the illustrations that offered evidence to the text. She also helped me understand by repetition with words and phrases.

As I came into the class, I saw the different areas of the classroom. The posters were very basic and had images to go with each word. This I believe was a great help to the non-Spanish speaking individuals. When Desiree read the story, she used expressive language to help articulate different parts. She read with much energy and excitement that would have easily drawn any child's attention. She also used face expressions that could be clues.

When you were reading the book and giving instructions, you used gestures to help explain what you were saying. Also, you repeated yourself slowly so that people could try to understand.   Lastly, there were plenty of pictures hanging up so that anyone who didn't understand or forgot could read and look at the picture to make sure they were doing the right thing.   You also gave examples, even though in Spanish, to show exactly how to do something.

Positive classroom climate
Students identified the importance of a positive classroom climate, drawing on their prior knowledge and how classroom climate and prior knowledge affected their frustration level:

The good attitude and confidence that you radiated made me more comfortable & open to learning. I know that if I had a teacher that did not have that attitude I would have been more confused & frustrated.

At first, I was totally lost. I could catch words that sounded familiar to me, but I was not confident at all. I saw/heard that Monica knew Spanish and a few other students knew key words, which made me feel even more insecure. I can see why students thrown into ESL situations tend to fall behind unless helped out by other students, ESL teachers, and other faculty.

At first I was entertained, then confused because I did not understand what you were saying. I then tried to focus on your hand motions, facial expressions and Spanish words I might have remembered from middle school. Those things helped a lot because had you just spoke Spanish without any other gestures or facial expressions I would not have understood anything. I also think it was very helpful that the instructor read us the book because it was something we were already familiar with. Although I did not understand every word she said I had read the book before and had a good idea as to what she was talking about.

Attention
Students identified the challenge of sustaining attention in the second language:

To make sure I was paying the best attention I could, I had to not pay attention to anything else and had to always have full eye contact with you, even when you were reading the story.

I just tried to stay focused on what was being said and not give up on comprehending the directions.

Setting goals for development
Finally, and most importantly, students identified clear goals for development of their own teaching:

As a teacher, I hope to be able to recognize those feelings in students who are not primarily English speaking students. I'd like to be able to learn enough of their language to help them both learn English and learn the material at hand because I know that if you hadn't been able to understand my questions in English, you would not have known what to explain.

I can allow students to learn from other students, and show positive reinforcement to aid in the understandings. Positive encouragement also motivates an individual to learn and understand. From the experience today, I felt overwhelmed at times, but the more the class went on the more comfortable I began to feel. Another thing to remember as a teacher of an ESL student is to remember not only are they learning a different language, they are put into a new culture, as well.

I felt during class that I wish my classes as a kid were how Desiree set up the classroom. I wish that I could have been in an integrated classroom. There was a knowledge and comfort to be able to speak your native language while learning another is a great learning atmosphere. En esta clase hoy yo estaba muy orguyosa estar con todas y hablar mi lenguaje/ In this class today I was very proud to be with everyone and speak my language. I want to evoke that emotion and comfort in my own students to be able to learn English yet still able to speak their native tongue. The thought of losing one's language because of assimilation has always troubled me. I wasn't allowed to speak Spanish in school. My mom and grandmother only spoke Spanish. Home life was hard because we never really used English and when we did it was spanglish. In that I want my students to know that in my class spanglish is welcome as long as they are learning how to bring in full English and keep their Spanish. This is very close to me.

Connecting this to the classroom, it is certainly important for teachers to recognize the emotional responses that affect students when they don't understand, whether it be due to language or some other learning challenge. We were in a room where most of us as students were in the "same boat." However, in the mainstream classroom today, this is not usually the case. For students whom English is their second language, they are quite often alone in their experience in the classroom. It becomes important for the teacher to sensitively support these students in becoming comfortable just being in the setting. In addition, a simple commitment to allow these students to acclimate to the situation—watch and observe for a certain amount of time before they will be called on to engage—this can help to alleviate anxiety about being put on the spot in front of the group.

So many changes have been made for the teacher and the learner, changes that help both to better understand each other through the learning process. An ESL teacher helps to mediate a second

language in such a way that is so intriguing that you can't help but to want to learn. Today's class was a direct representation of that. You were engaging and made me want to listen and try to understand what you were saying in Spanish. What helped was that you expressed yourself so well while teaching and reading the book. You showed as well as told.

That last comment—the importance of showing as well as telling—is I think the strongest argument for the power of a simulation approach to prepare candidates to serve linguistically diverse student populations. If they have an opportunity to walk in someone else's shoes, they perceive the whole road differently.

Lasting Impact and New Questions
The simulation experience described in this article lasted no longer than two hours each time I taught the course, the reflection and debrief no longer than an hour. However, it seems to have had a lasting impact on my students as they moved through the rest of their education coursework and into the teaching workforce. One of the many advantages of teaching "digital natives" (Prensky, 2001) is that I am connected to nearly all of my current and former students via Facebook. I asked them to report back how the experience stuck with them (if at all) and how it has informed their work with English language learning students.

One current student teacher, an experienced special education para-professional who will be graduating in December with her secondary social studies license, described the experience four semesters ago as, "the top lesson I have ever experienced. Coming from a special ed background, it truly 'smacked me in the face' and brought what my ESL students experienced on a daily basis front and center." Another near-graduate who was enrolled in the same section and who will be certified to teach early childhood commented, "I experienced what ESL students experience every day when they are faced with a teacher that does not teach in their language. It really reinforced the importance of reaching every student in any way possible. Even if it means learning another language, or trying every route possible to create a successful learning outcome and experience."

Another student who took the course three years ago, has begun her teaching career, and also has two school-aged children wrote:

Last week I was at open house for my 9th grader and her Spanish teacher opened the class by speaking only in Spanish...I thought of you and the simulation experience. During my student teaching I really went to bat for an ELL, and convinced my Cooperating Teacher that he wasn't Learning Disabled...he was an ELL! And by the end of the year he was reading at level! So your lesson taught me to be more aware of what students are understanding, or not, and making sure they are understanding the point of the lesson, and the instruction.

Finally, a student who took the course one year ago wrote:

Walking into a room and not understanding the language that Desiree was speaking was a confusing experience. I spent the whole time just trying to read her body language and visual cues instead of absorbing the material. It really put into perspective what ELL students go through on a daily basis.   No wonder the material is a struggle. ELL students desperately need the guidance of teachers and other students.   However, I will never forget how powerful they

could be as an addition to the classroom.   Teaching the students about their culture and language could be helpful to building social awareness.

These responses speak not only to the expanded sense of what it means to serve ELL students in schools, but to attune one's teaching to every student in one's care. In this way, I believe that the simulation approach used in this experience is aligned with principles of Universal Design (see Burgstahler, 2009).   Techniques, such as the following, that work for making content comprehensible in a second language support all students' understanding:
⬚ making the "point of the lesson" explicit and assessable

⬚ paying careful attention to how the learning environment supports the content objectives

⬚ presenting multiple modes of assessment

⬚ creating a culturally responsive classroom

⬚ demonstrating positive dispositions for teaching and learning.

I believe strongly that simulation could be used effectively by faculty in other foundational education courses, even faculty who are not bilingual.   Collaborating with world languages faculty to teach the simulation would also model how to co-teach effectively.   "Where the Wild Things Are" has been translated into fifteen languages and is only ten sentences long (even if one one speaks KiSwahili, it would not be overly onerous to translate).   In a world of increasing interconnectivity, preparing teachers to serve learners from diverse backgrounds is ever more urgent. A simulation approach, as proposed here, designed to address signature challenges of professional practice, can help teacher candidates to understand the imperative of attuning their teaching to their students.

Online Resources
 I videorecorded a recent semester's simulation experience and the whole class can be viewed at http://www.youtube.com/user/desireepointermace#grid/user/A03369394E58D2A4 . Similarly, my powerpoint for the experience can be viewed at:
http://www.slideshare.net/desireepointermace/second-language-learning-simulation.   I can be reached at http://alverno.academia.edu/DesireePointerMace/ . I look forward to hearing from teaching colleagues about how these ideas inform your practice in your settings!

References

Alverno College Faculty (1994). *Student Assessment-as-Learning at Alverno College.* Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College Institute.

Burgsthaler, S. (2009). Universal Design of Instruction (UDI): Definition, Principles, Guidelines, and Examples. Retrieved September 14, 2010 from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/Academics/instruction.html

Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Diez, Mary (1988). A Thrust from within: Reconceptualizing Teacher Education at Alverno College. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 65 (2); Programmatic Responses toward Contemporary Teacher Education Reform (Winter, 1988), 4-18.

Dyson, Anne Haas (1993). *Social Worlds of Children Learning to Write in an Urban Primary School.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Edelsky, C. and S. Hudelson (1980). Acquiring a Second Language When You're Not the Underdog. *Research in Second Language Acquisition: Selected Papers of the Los Angeles Second Langauge Research Forum.* R. C. Scarcella and S. D. Krashen. Rowley, MA, Newbury House.

Eisenberg, A. (1986). Teasing: verbal play in two Mexicano homes. In Schieffelin & Ochs Eds. *Language Socialization across Cultures*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Feistritzer, C. E. (2005). *Profile of teachers in the U.S. 2005*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Ferdman, B. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 181–204.

Fillmore, L. Wong. (1985) Teacher Talk as Input. In *Input in Second Language Acquisition.* S. Gass and C. Madden, Eds. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fillmore, L. W. (1992). Second-language learning in children: a model of language learning in social context. In *Language Processing by Bilingual Children.* Bialystok, E., Ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Loacker, G. & Rogers, G. (2005). *Assessment at Alverno College: Student, Program, Institutional.* Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College Institute.

Mentkowski, M. (2000). *Learning That Lasts: Integrating Learning, Development, and Performance in College and Beyond.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peters, A.M. & Boggs, S.T. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, Schieffelin, B.B., & Ochs, E, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 80-96.

Pointer, D. (1996). Why always has to be English in this class?: Native Spanish speakers confront linguistic dominance in a two-way immersion school.   Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Pointer, D. (1997). Constructing Bilingualism: the social foundations of a language community.   Unpublished position paper, University of California, Berkeley.

Pointer Mace, D. (2009). *Teacher Practice Online: Sharing Wisdom, Opening Doors*.   New York: Teachers College Press.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. Retrieved September 14, 2010, from http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford University Press. Part I, 3-61.

Sendak, Maurice (1963).   Where the wild things are / story and pictures by Maurice Sendak. New Yoro: Harper & Row.

Vásquez, O., Pease-Alvarez, L., Shannon, S. (1994). *Pushing Boundaries: Language and Culture in a Mexicano Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

A New Teacher Reflects on Her Teacher Preparation at an ACI Member College *by Hailey Pocic*

Author Bio: Hailey Pocic is a graduate of North Central College and teaches kindergarten at Robinson School in Chicago. She may be contacted at hjpocic@gmail.com.

Column

On June 15, 2010 I led my class of thirty-three students into the gymnasium for their kindergarten graduation. As the music played and their precious faces broke into wide grins upon seeing the room full of people who were there to admire them, I briefly closed my eyes and relished in the moment I had worked so hard to get to and many times thought I would never achieve. This was a moment I had difficulty imagining on that chilly Monday morning in February four months earlier when I met these children for the first time and felt like I had absolutely no idea what to do. I remember spending countless hours during the weekend prior reviewing the curriculum, writing lesson plans and developing a classroom management system. I scoured my college text books, binders and notebooks full of hastily taken notes from class lectures. Among all the information I encountered, I was unable to find anything titled: "What to do when you get hired in February in a high-needs school as the fourth teacher employed to teach and manage a classroom of thirty-three Kindergarten students." That morning, as I watched my class sprint down the hallway, casting their book bags to the ground, a few throwing punches at one another while others fled to the bathroom without permission and some began playing a game of tag, I realized that this was not the sunny scenario I had imagined for my first-year teaching experience. Little did I know, my first- year teaching experience would be more influential and rewarding than I had ever thought possible.

During the first few days with my class I quickly realized that their constant misbehaviors were silent cries for help. They yearned for a structured learning environment that promoted safety and consistency and rewarded positive behavior. The three previous teachers had left behind a string of unaddressed problems, unmet standards and unfinished concepts in the curriculum. I decided that I would not do the same and made it my goal to ensure these students would be successful. I changed everything about the classroom: the layout, schedule, procedures and decorations. These abrupt changes startled the students but they soon realized that despite their very vocal fear that I would leave, I was not going anywhere. As my face greeted them each morning without fail, they slowly began to trust me. I studied their reading, writing and math test scores to determine how to shape instruction. I chose not to adhere to the teacher manuals that did not accurately reflect where my students were in the curriculum, as many of the strategies found in the manuals did not fit my students' short attention spans and difficulty with impulse control.

Instead, I used the manuals as a guideline for what concepts my students needed to know while finding my own creative ways of providing instruction. I utilized unique games and music for phonics instruction, discovered literature to bolster math concepts, created journals for the students to express their ideas, enforced reading concepts using stories the students could relate to and found ways to incorporate social studies and science instruction into the reading curriculum. I set up a classroom library and implemented guided reading groups, literacy centers and free choice time. All the while I struggled with how to fairly and consistently handle misbehavior and promote positive behavior. Over time and with many attempted management techniques, their behaviors and attitudes improved, as did their test scores. Most importantly, their increased desire to learn and the results of their learning were

hugely evident in their questioning, positive thinking, ability to work independently and boundless excitement for what each day would bring.

One of the most valuable lessons I learned during my experience with this class is that exceptional teachers do not need an endless array of resources in order to provide students with meaningful classroom experiences. They do not need new computers, gleaming Smart Boards, hundreds of books, new crayons, fancy projector screens or moving carts of laptop computers. While these resources put schools at an incredible advantage, they do not ensure that students will be successful. More valuable than these resources or immaculate classrooms are compassionate teachers who are committed to doing what it takes to meet the needs of all students. Every student, no matter where they live, deserves that teacher. Never during my college experience did I think I could teach in a high-need setting. In fact, I was almost terrified of the idea because I thought I did not have what it takes.

The truth is that any effective teacher has what it takes.   I assumed teachers in high-need schools had to be harsh, uncreative and methodical in order to handle the types of misbehaviors that occur in many of these classrooms. Upon beginning my experience in such a classroom I realized that maybe there would not be as many misbehaviors if students were approached with compassion instead of harshness, teachers were imaginative instead of uncreative and routines were structured instead of methodical. No matter where a classroom is located, students have diverse needs that must be met through differentiated instruction and modified learning opportunities. These experiences are crafted by dedicated teachers who refuse to teach in the same way each day because they are constantly trying new ways to make learning worthwhile for students. These teachers are open to accepting students' needs and discovering what they can do to ensure that learning takes place. This must be done in every classroom, regardless of its location.

I encourage all preservice teachers to open their minds to the possibility of working in a high-need setting.   Take advantage of opportunities to work with students from various geographical areas, whether that means completing clinical hours, volunteering for a tutoring program or simply observing classrooms in your spare time. Regardless of where you teach during your preservice practicum experiences, reflect on the needs of your students and shape your lesson plans accordingly. Do not think of your lessons as isolated instances of learning for students where you can showcase your teaching abilities. Instead, view each lesson as an opportunity for you to discover how to best teach concepts that are part of overarching curriculum goals and experiences. Assess what the students already know about the concepts and determine what they should know by the end of the lesson and the end of the unit. Think about how you can appeal to the various ability levels and learning styles in the classrooms. Push past the suggested ways of teaching and discover how you can adapt those guidelines for your students.

Think about what stimulates your students' curiosity, what excites them and what they can relate to. Discover how your students respond to various management techniques and do not be afraid try new ideas. If one can do these things, one can teach anywhere. A professor once told me that during one of my preservice experiences when I thought I was destined for suburban education, but I did not believe it. I had no idea I could teach students effectively in a high-need school, let alone watch my once-intimidating class of thirty-three smiling students accept their Kindergarten diplomas, but I did. Even though I never found an article titled, "What to do when you get hired in February in a high-needs school as the fourth teacher employed to teach and manage a classroom of thirty-three Kindergarten students," I now realize that I already knew what to do: be a compassionate, committed teacher for those

children.   I am glad I stepped out of my comfort zone into the world of high-need education, a place that is much more comfortable than I ever could have imagined.