

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 550

SP 009 838

AUTHOR Lahnston, Anton; And Others
 TITLE An Urbal Multi-Linguistic Competency Based Preservice Field Based Teacher Preparation Program.
 INSTITUTION Boston Univ., Mass. School of Education.
 PUB DATE 15 Dec 75
 NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Differences; Cultural Pluralism; *Field Experience Programs; Internship Programs; *Multilingualism; *Preservice Education

ABSTRACT

With the conceptual model designed around the urban public and private school setting and its specific teaching strategies, this field-based teacher preparation program covers appropriate methodology in reading/language arts, social studies, and science. Students are afforded the opportunity of integrating content, theory, and practice into a totally field-based multilinguistic culturally diverse teaching/learning setting. Each semester program, comprised of approximately 40 junior interns, 30 cooperating teachers, 700 elementary pupils, and 4 university staff, is totally field-based in five urban schools. Content methods and instruction take place in one of the public school classrooms for a portion of each day; for the remainder of the day the interns work in their assigned classrooms. Program competencies are designed to emphasize the specification, learning, and demonstration of those behaviors which are essential to effective teaching. Program research emphasizing the effects of the training site on selected teacher training variables has been consistently evaluated within a multi-dimensional scheme. The research results have provided evidence in support of the field-based teacher preparation program, evidencing that field-based preservice teachers have more positive feelings toward their teaching experience than university-based preservice teachers. In the cognitive domain, as evidenced by pupil growth, field-based interns have demonstrated an ability to positively affect pupil learning. (Author)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED118550

DEC 15 1975

AN URBAN MULTI-LINGUISTIC COMPETENCY BASED
PRESERVICE FIELD BASED TEACHER
PREPARATION PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted by:

Boston University
School of Education
December 15, 1975

Dr. Anton Lahnston
Dr. Diane Lapp
Dr. Richard Rezba

P 009 . 838

SUMMARY

With the conceptual model designed around the urban public and private school setting and its specific teaching strategies, the field-based teacher preparation program covers appropriate methodology in Reading/Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science. Students are afforded the opportunity of integrating content, theory, and practice into a totally field-based multi-linguistic culturally diverse teaching/learning setting. Each semester the program, comprised of approximately 40 junior interns, 30 cooperating teachers, 700 elementary pupils, and 3 university staff, is totally field-based in five urban schools. Content methods and instruction take place in one of the public school classrooms for a portion of each day; for the remainder of the day the interns work in their assigned classrooms.

Program competencies are designed to emphasize the specification, learning, and demonstration of those behaviors (cognitive, affective, performance, consequence) which are essential to effective teaching. Through competency monitoring evaluation of both program theory and practical application has been generated which provides opportunities for immediate as well as longitudinal assessment and redesign.

Program research emphasizing the effects of training site on selected teacher training variables has been consistently evaluated within a multi-dimensional scheme. The research results have provided evidence in support of the field-based teacher preparation program, evidencing that field-based pre-service teachers have more positive feelings toward their teaching experience than university-based pre-service teachers. In the cognitive domain, as evidenced by pupil growth, field-based interns have demonstrated an ability to positively affect pupil learning.

In view of the success of the program, public documents have been generated to aid other universities in the development of such programs.

Robert A. Dentler

Description and Development of the Program

Based on the concept of teacher education in field settings and the need for empirical data to support growing trends toward field-based programs, the following undergraduate program was developed. Early in the fall semester of 1972/1973, the staff of Boston University's junior year methods block program (part of the CH 300 series) began planning for a field-based alternative within the existing integrated model. Traditionally, all methods instruction was conducted on campus with field experience being provided in the greater metropolitan area only one day each week. The newly planned alternative was structured so that instruction in the content methods would be given in the field and that the students would intern in elementary classrooms three days per week during the entire semester. Boston schools were contacted, and numerous planning sessions took place with the teachers to define needs, goals, and expectations.

This program was first implemented in January of 1973, at which time the field-based juniors (25) received all instruction in a public school classroom. Instruction in the content areas was interwoven with experience in the classroom three to four days a week. For example, on a typical Monday, the junior interns were involved in methods instruction (reading/language arts, science or social studies) from 8-10:00, and for the remainder of the school day the interns worked in their assigned classrooms. During this time the interns were supervised and assisted by the program staff including the public school cooperating teachers.

It became apparent during the first semester of the program that expansion was necessary, as more students wanted to participate in a totally field-based learning environment. Moreover, the staff wanted to modify the program based on research results as well as provide greater options within the program so interns could work in different classroom models. Planning meetings with the staff of other area schools, including one parochial school, resulted in the addition of three schools to the program for a total of five urban schools.

Continual program revisions have occurred based on research efforts which have been consistently part of the program since its inception. In the fall of 1974, funds were granted by the Right to Read Program to facilitate and expand these research efforts and to emphasize the development of reading skills through an integrated content areas model.

Throughout the past four years, continuous planning, evaluation and re-planning efforts have been carried out, resulting in an operational model of teacher education in an urban, field-based setting.

Objectives

Program objectives are categorized within the following three major areas:

I. CORE Objectives

Skills in instruction are divided into six major categories stressing an objectives-based approach to teaching. The selection and derivation of behavioral objectives is followed by developmental competencies in sequencing instruction, application of classroom evaluative techniques, and systematic planning and management of instruction. Basic to these skills is the ability to interpret and apply cognitive theory and ability to identify and implement question-asking skills. The topic of curriculum materials is outlined in two major divisions of teacher competencies: core and interdisciplinary use of curriculum materials. More specifically core objectives assist interns in:

1. developing a mastery of a variety of diagnostic instruments and techniques;
2. developing the ability to individualize instruction;
3. utilizing a variety of teaching experiences with children in school settings including one-to-one instruction, single group instruction, and whole class instruction;
4. identifying and justifying utilization of textbooks and supplementary curriculum materials;
5. identifying and utilizing specific content area materials with interdisciplinary applications;
6. selecting and deriving performance objectives;
7. identifying and applying question-asking skills;

8. interpreting and applying cognitive theory;
9. developing competency for sequencing instruction;
10. developing and applying classroom evaluation techniques; and
11. systematically planning and managing instruction.

II. Content Area Objectives

Instructional competencies are organized for three content areas (a) reading/language arts, (b) science, and (c) social studies. Each area includes both the content and sequence of those factors considered fundamental to instruction in that content area. Furthermore, instructional concerns which are generic and relate to all content areas are necessarily repeated for fulfillment of sequential needs in each particular area. The development of teaching skills in all three content areas facilitates the development of instructional competencies, thus enabling the intern to integrate two or more content areas to provide interdisciplinary experiences for children where possible.

A. Reading/Language Arts objectives assist interns in:

1. developing an understanding of the reading process;
2. developing a mastery of a variety of approaches to the teaching of reading;
3. integrating reading instruction into subject matter courses such as social studies and science;
4. developing an understanding of the language development of children, and how to stimulate it in the classroom;
5. developing an understanding and appreciation of children's literature so that it can be presented effectively;
6. developing appropriate skills and attitudes to teach reading to children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds; and
7. explaining and applying methods for developing the language arts.

B. Science objectives assist interns in:

1. demonstrating an ability to utilize basic process skills;
2. demonstrating an ability to utilize integrated process skills;
3. demonstrating an ability to utilize concepts from various science fields;

4. demonstrating an understanding of the reading/language process as it related to the teaching of science;
5. identifying rationale, objectives, and teacher-student role in major elementary science project materials; and
6. identifying sources of elementary science materials and services.

C. Social Studies objectives assist interns in:

1. identifying and applying social studies teaching strategies.
2. identifying and analyzing social studies materials.
3. demonstrating an understanding of the reading/language process as it relates to the teaching of social studies; and
4. demonstrating an ability to develop and implement a unit of study incorporating social studies strategies and materials.

III. Self-Assessment Objectives

Attitudes toward teaching and self-assessment comprise two areas of major importance in the preparation of interns. Objectives are related to the recognition and enhancement of positive attitudinal growth factors and to the adaptation of evaluation models of teaching performance for self-analysis, critique, and remediation. More specifically, self-assessment objectives assist interns in:

1. developing positive personal attitudes towards teaching; and
2. developing and utilizing self-assessment techniques for personal growth.

Personnel

Program personnel consists of the following three full-time Boston University assistant professors.

Dr. Anton Lahnston
Department of Social Education

Dr. Diane Lapp
Departments of Reading and Language Education and
Childhood and Curriculum Education

Dr. Richard Rezba
Department of Science and Mathematics Education

Budget

Salaries for the three assistant professors and instructional materials are

provided for as regular line items within the School of Education operational budget. Classroom space in the field is provided without cost by the Boston Public School System.

While budget to support program staff is provided by Boston University, limited supplemental research funds have been provided through a Right to Read Grant. The expiration of these supplemental funds will not alter any components of program operation.

Contribution to the Improvement of Teacher Education

This field-based teacher-preparation program has evolved to a point where it is institutionalized at Boston University and at the same time transferable to other university settings. This is exemplified through a clearly stated set of goals and objectives along with a systematic process for evaluation on four levels, affective, cognitive, performance, and consequence. Data regarding the degrees of attainment of these goals and objectives have been generated and shared as a public document in an attempt to aid other universities in the developmental stages of designing field-based programs. Since the outset of this program, the process of research evaluation and program change has been integral to ongoing development. Hence, teacher education has available the information of continual evaluation and the resulting model program based on this systematic assessment and replanning.

The program is based in multi-linguistic, culturally diverse urban schools. In this setting, interns are provided the opportunity to implement diagnostic/ prescriptive techniques throughout the content areas, thus furthering the individualized attention being received by the children in the various classrooms as well as developing the competencies of the interns in the school settings. Concurrently, the inservice (cooperating) teachers have received and utilized the methodological input from the program along with materials and general university support options.

Another major contribution of the program is the process of integrating multiple reading skills into the various content areas, thus interns become aware of the benefits and processes involved in both designing and implementing thematic

teaching. This factor, along with a team teaching approach by the university faculty provides a program model that offers numerous options for implementation in a variety of university/school settings.

Evaluation Methods and Results

The effects of training site and emphasis in reading in the content areas on selected teacher training variables have been investigated within a multi-dimensional research design. Analyses include measures of immediate and longitudinal effects. The research model includes affective, cognitive, teacher performance and pupil growth measures. More specifically study objectives are:

1. To compare junior interns trained in a field-based teacher education program with interns trained in a university-based program on selected teacher variables.
2. To compare field-based junior interns trained in "reading in the content areas" by both content area staff and reading/language arts staff with interns trained in "reading in the content areas" by the reading/language arts staff only.
3. To gather evidence of growth in cognitive skills in pupils instructed by field-based interns.
4. To compare senior student teachers trained in a field-based junior year program with seniors trained in a university-based junior year program on selected teacher variables.
5. To identify variables that could be used to predict teacher performance.

Results support the immediate and longitudinal significance of extensive field experience in each domain; however, analysis of the effect of emphasis on reading in the content areas is at the present time inconclusive. The interns demonstrated an ability to positively affect pupil learning which was evidenced through measures of classroom growth. The evaluation methods utilized within this program demonstrate multi-dimensional procedure for the assessment of teacher training programs.