DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 822   FL 020 641

AUTHOR   Dalton, Stephanie; Moir, Ellen
TITLE   Evaluating Limited English Proficient (LEP) Teacher
                Training and In-Service Programs.
PUB DATE   Aug 92
NOTE   43p.; In: Focus on Evaluation and Measurement.
                Volumes 1 and 2. Proceedings of the National Research
                Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student
                Issues (2nd, Washington, DC, September 4-6, 1991);
                see FL 020 630.
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints
                (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Academic Achievement; Achievement Gains; Educational
                Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher
                Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Limited
                English Speaking; Program Descriptions; *Program
                Evaluation; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT
                This paper discusses evaluating
Limited-English-proficient (LEP) teacher training and inservice
programs. It is suggested that this kind of teacher training can
provide teachers with assistance necessary to increase the academic
performance of linguistically and culturally diverse students. The
history of teacher education evaluation, particularly its
methodology, is reviewed, and current recommendations from research
on effective education of linguistically diverse students are
examined. Experiences with an evaluated preservice and an inservice
teacher education program are reported. The preservice program was a
University of Hawaii alternative program and the inservice program
was part of the California New Teacher Project at the University of
California at Santa Cruz. Based on the presentation of teacher
education program evaluation literature, the findings of recent
research on effective teaching and learning models for linguistic
minorities and the experiences of the preservice and inservice
programs, the paper concludes with recommendations for LEP preservice
and inservice teacher education program evaluation. (VWL)

Evaluating Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Teacher Training
and In-Service Programs

Stephanie Dalton
National Center for the Study of Cultural Diversity
and Second Language Learning

and

Ellen Moir
Board of Studies in Education
University of California, Santa Cruz

Evaluating Limited English Proficient (LEP) Teacher Training and In-Service Programs

Stephanie Dalton
National Center for the Study of Cultural Diversity
and Second Language Learning

and

Ellen Moir
Board of Studies in Education
University of California, Santa Cruz

The topic of this paper, Evaluating LEP Teacher Training and In-Service Programs, is, unfortunately, among the least reported issues in the literature of teacher education research. The consequences of this neglect are evident not only in program evaluation's underdevelopment and in unexamined teacher education progiams but also in the individual experiences of increasing numbers of teachers nationwide. LEP Teacher training and in-service programs can provide teachers with the assistance necessary to increase the academic performance of linguistically and culturally diverse students. There is a growing knowledge base regarding the content and pedagogy of effective education of LEP students. In addition, qualitative and quantitative methodologies offer diverse measures for obtaining useful data about program experience to apply in program development.

In this paper, the authors first briefly review the history of teacher education evaluation, particularly its methodology, and then examine content recommendations coming from current research on effective education of linguistically diverse students. Secondly, they report their experiences with an evaluated preservice and an in-service teacher education program. The preservice program was a University of Hawaii alternative program titled Preservice Education for Teachers of Minorities (PETOM) and the in-service program was part of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) at the University of California at Santa Cruz. Based on the presentation of teacher education program evaluation literature, the findings of recent research on effective teaching and learning models for linguistic minorities, and the experiences of the preservice and in-service programs, the paper will conclude with recommendations for LEP preservice and in-service teacher education program evaluation. The recommendations place emphasis on generating evaluation designs

415

3

that yield useful information for teacher education program develop-
ers and faculty, the use of broad based methods to obtain multiple
perspectives on program experience and effect, and the desirability of
program evaluation design that informs and involves all partici-
pants.

Introduction

A literature search in 1988 for documentation of multicultural
program evaluation produced a single reference. This situation has
changed little since for programs addressing educational issues of
cultural or linguistic diversity. To underscore the void in this do-
main, teacher education program evaluation, in general, has been
referred to as "teacher education's orphan" (Galluzzo and Craig,
1990).

Cooper's (1983) summary of program evaluation in teacher edu-
cation included a very short list of institutions (such as the Univer-
sity of Georgia and Ohio State University) where evaluation was an
integral part of teacher education program development. Although
few examples exist in the literature, survey responses indicate that
more evaluation is actually practiced. In the same year as Cooper's
summary, Adams & Craig (1983) conducted a survey of institutions
affiliated with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Edu-
cation (AACTE). The survey, a follow-up questionnaire, was mailed
to teacher education programs across the nation. The survey identi-
fied four hundred institutions that gathered program evaluation
data

These reports suggest a possible mismatch of program evaluation
literature and practice. It appears that program evaluation is indeed
conducted but primarily for accountability reports to accrediting or
other external agencies. Certainly program evaluation design must
meet the reporting requirements and criteria of official agencies such
as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
(NCATE), State Commissions for Teacher Credentialing and the Na-
tional Association of State Directors for Teacher Education Certifica-
tion (NASDTEC).

It appears that in practice little program evaluation is specifi-
cally designed for internal use in program improvement or to in-
crease understanding about developmental processes. This means
that the suitability of teacher education curricula for the communi-
ties served, the effect of program on professional and LEP student
consumers, and experiences of program participants remain largely
unexplored. With so few examples of evaluated programs available,
teacher education programs experience little pressure to evaluate.
Evaluation's low priority in preservice and in-service teacher educa-

tion program development is one explanation for programs' unresponsiveness to rapidly changing teaching conditions.

First Recommendation

Our first recommendation is that LEP teacher education and in-service programs employing evaluation need to be identified and documented. More examples will provide the models, explore the process, and stimulate the installation of an evaluation component in programs.

We know the nation is facing a major challenge in reshaping its schools to be appropriate to the diversity of its population. The public school demographic trends are changing for teachers and students. For example, the state of California has positions for 11,000 bilingual teachers. Last year, the University of California trained 272 bilingual teachers. An OBEMLA sponsored forum on "Staffing the Multilingually Impacted Schools of the 1990s" produced evidence from the participating administrators indicating a current shortage of 175,000 bilingual teachers nationwide if a 20:1 student-teacher ratio is considered. Demographic imbalance between non-minority teachers and minority students means that teachers will be working with students whose backgrounds are culturally and linguistically different from their own. Sometimes, as in the case in the Los Angeles School District, veteran teachers are finding the demographics of their classroom changing from year to year and from familiar cultural and linguistic backgrounds to those that are totally unfamiliar.

LEP teacher training and in-service programs can provide teachers with the assistance necessary to increase the academic performance of linguistically and culturally diverse students. While there is yet no template for effective LEP student instruction, there is a substantial knowledge base regarding the content and pedagogy of effective education of LEP students. For example, the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning is currently engaged in identifying and documenting the instructional practices of effective teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse minorities. These findings will provide the working models of effective instructional practice informing the continuing debate regarding the education of linguistic minorities.

Teacher education programs can use these effective models for educating LEP students as resources for their own program development. Programs desiring to import information from models, the knowledge base on effective education for linguistic and culturally diverse students, new research findings, and other sources design evaluation to aid this process. The University of Hawaii and California programs described in this paper have program evaluation com-

ponents. The notion of evaluation design emerging from these pro-
gram experiences is one that obtains useful feedback about program
operations as well as processes. Importantly, in this notion is the
means that programs use to respond to evaluative feedback and dis-
cover their own developmental processes.

Second Recommendation

The second recommendation is directed to the issue of program
responsiveness. Program responsiveness to evaluation feedback
needs documentation. Evaluation methodology designed to yield rel-
evant, substantive, and useful information for program developers
and faculty is most likely to result in program responsiveness to feed-
back. More examples from evaluated programs will encourage this
practice and demonstrate useful evaluation design.

The history of the documentation of teacher education evalua-
tion, particularly its methodology, is worth reviewing for models of
effective and less effective LEP program evaluation documentation.
Content recommendations coming from current research on effective
education of linguistically diverse students relate to evaluation is-
sues and influence program evaluation form and construction. The
trends and themes in the history of teacher education program
evaluation can inform LEP teacher education program evaluation.

Although there is no evidence that linguistically diverse students
were ever norm group members or that models influencing evalua-
tion design were validated on them, the record of experience is useful
for understanding what methods produce useful information for pro-
gram developers. The earliest evaluation reports dating from the
1940s relied on models of evaluation emphasizing goal attainment,
product orientation, and teacher performance competency based on
program objectives.

A 1944 publication by Troyer and Pace described methods used
by teacher education institutions to evaluate programs. They identi-
fied program components such as the general education component,
the professional education sequence, student teaching and follow-up
studies and described a variety of methods for assessing the skills,
attitudes, and understandings of preservice teachers. According to
Galluzzo and Craig (1990), teacher education evaluation has only
minimally shifted since the 1944 documentation. As in an AACTE
survey by Adams & Craig (1983), program evaluation reports con-
tinue to rely heavily on single tap follow-up surveys.

The preponderance of follow-up studies that consist of post-
graduates' self-reports raise issues of reliability and validity. The
usefulness of such data for program development has been rightly
challenged. For example, Katz et al. (1981) critically reviewed 26

studies using graduates' responses to follow-up questionnaires as evaluation data. Here Katz et al. contributed the "feed-forward" principle. Feed-forward is defined as the "resistance from the student at the time of exposure to given learnings and, later, protestations that the same learnings had not been provided, should have been provided or should have been provided in stronger doses" (p. 21). This situation illustrates the substantial validity limitations on data gathered through questionnaires from individuals after the experience of the program. Katz et al. call for evaluation data that will be more informative for program effectiveness and development.

In 1970, Sandefur's monograph on a model for program evaluation described a product-oriented, competency-based approach. In this outcomes based model, selected competencies served as objectives of the program for student and new teacher performance. This model has been re-energized in the 1987 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) guidelines which emphasize the degree to which students achieve objectives of a program. Medley (1977) in addressing teacher education program evaluation defined it as the extent to which "the training experiences produce the competencies defined as objectives of the training program" (Medley, 1977, p.69).

In the 1980s, the value of alternative approaches including increased description and documentation of on-going program experience from the participants' point of view were recognized and called for. Qualitative methodology was recommended for capturing program features previously ignored. These features included program antecedents, contexts of program operation, intended audience, developmental and process issues. This approach meant previously unexplored issues relating to student and teacher language and thinking development could be studied.

In sum, design and implementation of on-going teacher education program evaluation is currently defined in wider ranging terms than the narrowly conceived outcomes-based orientation that has been predominant. Methodology that has been overladen with self-report particularly from graduate surveys has produced data that program developers are hard pressed to find a use for. The link between actual program practices and teacher development, as a result, is substantially unexamined.

Third Recommendation

Our third recommendation for program evaluation supports methodological approaches employing quantitative and qualitative inquiry methods for the purpose of exploring processes and transformations produced by programs and experienced by preservice and inservice teachers. The program itself is engaging a process in design-

ing and conducting evaluation and this is worthy of attention. The use of broad based methods and measures that obtain multiple perspectives on program experience and effect is most likely to capture information about developmental processes and the links between program and sources of influence.

Issues of LEP Student Education

In reviewing the recommendations coming from current research about augmenting linguistic minority student achievement, consensus on every issue is rare, but understanding of the issues in the form of a substantial knowledge base is accumulating. New data are providing better understanding of the cognitive assets associated with high degrees of bilingualism (Diaz, 1983, Hakuta, 1986). Language learning research is indicating that second language development is not significantly impeded by native language and human cognition is indeed organized to accommodate new language learning (McLaughlin, 1990). The position that bilingualism is a deficit condition is no longer sustainable.

Among these themes surrounding the education of LEP students, one of the most central concerns is the instructional use of the languages of bilinguals in classrooms (Garcia, 1990). Recent research reports of Wong-Fillmore, Ramirez and the growing influence of Vygotskian theory inform our understanding about the critical role of language in the education of LEP students.

Wong-Fillmore's (1991) position that children of linguistic minorities are assimilating into English at the expense of their home language is another theme of the debate. Capitalizing on the common belief that the younger a learner is the faster and more completely a new language can be learned, states have legislated younger and younger English-only instruction. What has been ignored in this policy is the cost to the young learners and their families in primary language loss -- what has been referred to as "subtractive bilingualism" (Wong-Fillmore, p. 1, 1991). New language learning is not dependent on inattention to native language and the social consequences of this approach to LEP student education have been made sadly clear.

Ramirez' (1991) longitudinal study compared the relative effectiveness of three bilingual programs: (1) structured English immersion strategy, (2) late-exit and (3) early-exit transitional bilingual education. The study's findings strongly support the effectiveness of bilingual programs and indicate that students exposed to more English in English Immersion programs perform no better overall on tests of English language ability than do students in early- or late-exit bilingual programs.

Of particular interest for this topic, Ramirez found teachers' responses to the challenge of heterogeneous LEP classrooms to be remarkably similar in that a minimum of language production opportunities were provided for the students. When students were separated by language classifications of LEP, Fluent English Speakers (FEP) and English Only (EO), there was no difference in teachers' talk among the three programs. In mixed classes of LEP, FEP and EOs, teachers' talk did differ in that they explained, modelled and monitored more often asking fewer questions, giving fewer instructions and less feedback. In other words, teachers talked to the students more while asking the students for less talk. For all students, there was scant dialogue or instructional conversation. Teacher talk predominated in all the programs at two times the rate of student talk. When teachers and students did interact students' responses were frequently nonverbal or simple information recall statements.

This evidence presented in the Ramirez study supports the persistence of the assessment or recitation model of instruction which minimizes social interaction and student language production. The "script" of the recitation model consists of assigning text material to students, asking them to "recite" from it, most often through quiz, worksheet, or test, and assessing whether or not the students learned it. This teaching-by-assessment is in contrast to teaching-by-assistance, a model of teaching associated with the theoretical work of L.S. Vygotsky (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

From Vygotsky and his disciples and elaborators, we are coming to know how teaching takes place in ordinary interactions of everyday life and results in the generation of higher order thinking. "The developmental level of a child is identified by what the child can do alone. What the child can do with the assistance of another defines what (Vygotsky) called the zone of proximal development....It is in the proximal zone that teaching may be defined." In Vygotskian terms, teaching is good only when it 'awakens and rouses to life those functions which are in a stage of maturing, which lie in the zone of proximal development.' (Vygotsky, 1956, p. 278, quoted in Wertsch & Stone, 1985, Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 4). In this redefinition of teaching, teachers assist students through their Zones of Proximal Development anticipating, selecting and maximizing the moments to assist student performance.

Of the many ways to assist performance, dialogue, the ability "to form, express, and exchange ideas in speech and writing" is fundamental to the development of thinking skills and "is the way parents teach their children language and letters." Dialogue or, in Tharp & Gallimore's term, the Instructional Conversation, occurs through "the questioning and sharing of ideas and knowledge that happens in conversation" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 5). The Ramirez finding that teachers in the study generated few language production oppor-

tunities for LEP students raises questions about teachers' knowledge base and skill level in regard to language development and its relationship to cognition. In a Vygotskian conception of teaching and learning, the absence of dialogue or instructional conversation seriously constrains development of students' higher level thinking and complex learning.

Fourth Recommendation

Therefore our fourth recommendation for LEP teacher education program evaluation is that it identify and examine programmatic features and teachers' experiences important to language development. Language development features include teacher student ratio of talk, progression and level of student teacher talk, and student opportunities for talk using school language and students' first language or dialect. Data collection strategies for language development include observation, informal records and student interactive journal entries, and other productions. Alternate data collection strategies for other programmatic features include descriptive summaries and samples of student materials.

Examples of Preservice and
In-Service Program Evaluation

The program evaluation experience of two programs, a University of Hawaii alternative program, Preservice Education for Teachers of Minorities (PETOM), and the California New Teacher Project (CNTP), at the University of California at Santa Cruz (SCCNTP), provides examples of veteran and preservice teacher education program evaluation.

PETOM Preservice Program Experience

In a state with a majority population of linguistic minorities such as Samoan, Tongan, Filipino, Laotian and Hawaiian Creole or pidgin dialect speakers, many students', and particularly those at-risk, sole experience with Standard American English occurs only in the school setting. The Native Hawaiian Educational Assessment Project described "Persons of Native Hawaiian ancestry" as those who "have suffered disproportionately from educational and social inequality for some time. Descendants of the original inhabitants of Hawaii find themselves at the bottom of indicators of success in modern America, and they are sometimes referred to as "strangers in their own land" (1983, p. 3). As a teacher educator and alternative teacher education program developed at the University of Hawaii, oral and written language development of young people was as central a curricular issue for teacher preparation as multicultural understanding and sensitivity.

The faculty of an experimental teacher education program, titled Preservice Education for Teachers of Minorities (PETOM), was committed to preparing teachers to provide at-risk minority students with experiences in language leading to the attainment of literacy and the ability to function in mainly verbal settings such as those of classrooms and, eventually, the workplace, community and society.

This commitment was underscored by the inclusion of a semester course in Language Development within the program's two-year, field based curriculum. PETOM's efforts to evaluate its program quality and student development were collaborative producing and evaluation report each year for six years. Three features of PETOM, the program's origins, curriculum, organization and conceptual framework relate to the program's evaluation experience.

First, PETOM grew from the work of the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) teacher consulting model. In KEEP's model of in-service teacher consultation, evaluation was continuous taking the form of weekly observation and feedback collegially provided by a peer consultant and quarterly data feedback provided by criterion-referenced testing. KEEP's in-service teacher training effectiveness was evaluated by the use of standardized test scores of Hawaiian, part-Hawaiian students' reading skills. While undoubtedly successful, KEEP's in-service teacher training program invested 3 to 5 years in teacher development.

PETOM, as an outgrowth of KEEP, sought to capitalize on the preparation, practice, and reflection time available to preservice teachers during their professional training. A preservice teacher education program incorporating the principles of KEEP combined with extensive field experience in classrooms serving diverse students could facilitate preservice teachers' developmental course from novice to skilled.

Secondly, PETOM's curriculum included generic methods emphasizing integration of the content areas, language development, inquiry process, classroom management, child development and foundations. Faculty objectives for the course work included the translation of theory into practice and maximal modeling of instructional strategies. Course work built directly on the novice teachers' field experiences.

Thirdly, PETOM's faculty worked collaboratively to develop and implement the program. The Methods Instructors commented about their experience saying,

"Traditional instruction for preservice teachers is scattered among different faculty members who rarely talk with one an-

other. No single group is responsible for seeing the preservice teachers through their entire program. As Eisner pointed out, university faculties may be even more isolated than elementary classroom teachers. Teacher educators rarely know what the other is teaching and rarely, if ever, observe one another teach. PETOM has provided an opportunity to break down this isolation" (Picard & Young, 1990, p.31).

The program's theoretical framework, a Vygotskian conception, sensitized the faculty to the ways that teachers assist students to learn and teacher educators assist preservice teachers. The faculty struggled to understand the development of teachers' professional thinking and skills by the Vygotskian principles; as students learn in conversation with their teachers, teachers learn in conversation with their faculties and in the classrooms of their early field experiences. PETOM's preservice teachers were assisted through their proximal zones, by their instructors and/or peers in program activity including classroom interactions, course discussion, interactive journals and peer and/or instructor review of lesson videotapes.

Again PETOM Instructors described it saying,

"there are times when we may not seem to be clear as to whether we are talking about the education of teachers or the education of children. The truth is that many of the principles that follow apply to both. Our expectation is that teachers will teach as they have learned" (Picard & Young, 1990, p. 31).

As an experimental program within the College of Education, PETOM conducted annual program evaluations. Over the course of three cohorts of two years duration each, several evaluation designs were used. The findings were reported to the Dean, relevant College of Education committees, and other audiences. However, of the greatest importance was the feedback to the faculty for program development purposes. The faculty was responsive to positive and critical feedback provided directly by the students, revising course work requirements and on communication issues. All of the evaluation methodology used represented faculty interest in obtaining feedback about developing their own and teacher performance competence in conceptual and specific skill areas emphasized in the program.

The measures used and listed in Appendix A included checklists of the College of Education for rating performance competence of the PETOM teachers. PETOM checklist data was compared to control group checklist data from the traditional program. Demographic data, such as ethnicity, age, grade point average and place of birth, were compiled demonstrating PETOM's commitment to diversity in

12

its recruitment and retention. PETOM students and graduates were interviewed about their program experience and asked to rate their program experiences and the program components. Cooperating Teachers were interviewed about their experiences in the program. Principals in the schools where PETOM students were hired as first year teachers were interviewed for their perspective on the PETOM teachers performance. Situational probes were devised to discriminate between PETOM students and the control group for competence in program emphases such as language development and the use of culturally compatible teaching strategies. Open ended, stimulated recall interviews of the preservice teachers were a requirement of the field experience. Some of these were conducted and coded. Of these methods, the students' ratings, principals' comments, situational probes, and open-ended interviews will be presented and discussed.

Student Ratings

After the first cohort of PETOM students had taught, they were given a survey questionnaire to rate the usefulness and relevance of their learning experiences in the program to their subsequent teaching. Their ratings demonstrated that the students considered their general undergraduate course work (in their case, the first two years of university general education requirements) barely relevant (or 2 out of a possible 5 points) to their teaching preparation. In contrast, the field experience opportunity was considered most relevant with a rating of 4.5 out of a possible 5 points. The education course work was also very positively valued at just under 4.5.

Immediately after the third cohort of students completed the program, they were asked to rate questions about their PETOM education. In the ratings, there is a positive trend in general. However, the pattern emerging from the rank ordering is one that indicates the graduates favored the more participatory kinds of experiences such as student teaching and observation-participation over the course work and the field experience seminars (Speidel, 1990, p. 77).

While it is desirable to understand the perspectives of program graduates, the value of this type of feedback to the faculty and program is limited. These measures validate novice hunger for hands-on experience and give little information about teacher development. To obtain more useful data for their purposes, the faculty decided to obtain data from the principals hiring the program graduates.

Principals' Comments

Overall the Principal's comments were positive describing the teachers as good, fine, excellent, and strong. The principals' negative comments included such statements as: (1) the teachers had difficul-

ties applying their knowledge due to lack of experience (3 times) and (2) the teachers need more relevant field experience (3 times). One principal commented on a teacher's unsmiling demeanor. In the narratives, principals described teachers indicating their own criteria for good teaching. One example is:

Principals' Narrative Data Samples:

"I think Bev is a really good example of an excellent teacher. She is just beginning now to take some responsibility for the rest of the faculty in sharing some of her ideas. She attended a workshop where she had to come back and share what she had learned with the rest of the faculty and she did an excellent job. I look upon her as someone who will someday become Teacher of the Year. She is unassuming and sincere in her efforts. Bev is always open and eager to learn. I think either your program did a good job on her or else she is just a natural teacher. I think your program should take some of the credit. Beverly is exemplary."

Joan and the other two PETOM graduates now teaching at my school are very enthusiastic and always willing to learn. They have a good knowledge base and are well equipped with effective teaching strategies although being new teachers they are still having difficulties applying them.

They are middle-class teachers dealing with low-income, severely at-risk youngsters and this is an incredibly hard task. Therefore, they have had to make a lot of adjustment this first year and in many ways they are not yet fully equipped. I look at these teachers as slowly evolving and in two more years they will be top-notch. But they are never frustrated or depressed. They are lovely people who are trying hard and maintaining very good attitudes despite the many obstacles that working with deprived youngsters bring.

Working on the Leeward Coast is always a very frustrating experience for very new teachers because most of them have not had the hands-on time with these kinds of kids. They have to first experiment with and weed through a multitude of teaching strategies before finding those that are most effective. These strategies must address all kinds of kids and not just those found at Kamehameha Schools or in town. Most young teachers have not had enough field experience in this area and it would really help if they spent time out here before graduating from school....I think your program is wonderful but your graduates need to spend more time in areas such as this before they can be truly competent new teachers. These teachers are growing this year and they are always willing to learn. I am sure they will evolve into first-rate teachers."

For the faculty, principals' comments were validating in that the PETOM students were generally successful as beginning professionals in a school setting. This data was informative about contexts of school culture and community and revealed the principal's belief in the value of "hands-on experience" and the artistry of teaching. The data were less useful for increasing faculty understanding about the effectiveness of their course work. The teacher characteristics highlighted in these comments, while important, were only generally related to course work objectives.

The faculty decided to design measures for collecting course work specific data from PETOM preservice teachers. Situational probes were constructed by the instructors for each course completed during the year of the evaluation. The written probes explored for the effect of the experience of PETOM on its preservice teachers by asking them to provide substantive responses when presented with written situations. It was hypothesized that PETOM student responses would be program specific and substantively richer than those of a control group of students from the traditional program. An example of a Situational Probes developed by the Language Development course Instructor follows:

Situational Probe

You've organized your second grade class into small instructional groups, but you've noticed that the discussions you've been having in these groups haven't been going as well as you'd like. The students typically give one word overly brief responses. You'd like them to give lengthier answer and elaborate on each other's responses.

a. What will you do in an effort to improve the discussions?

b. What are your reasons for suggesting these actions?

Sample answers given by PETOM students:

1. Ask open-ended questions, questions that allow for more divergent responses. Ask student to elaborate answers. Open/divergent questions require more than one word responses and also give teacher and students a "forum" for extending answers -- ask students to explain response, add to it.

2. I would try to state questions in such a way that requires more than one word answers. Questions could begin with "Why do you think...?," "How...? " "What could/would happen if...?," "What do you think about...?" ...However, I think that all this must be taught to the students; they need to be guided through a discus-

sion. At first, the teacher must take the lead but the ultimate goal would be for the teacher to only help focus and clarify in a discussion.

3. I would draw on the children's background and experiences. By drawing on experiences, the discussion becomes more interesting and students will feel comfortable in contributing to the discussion.

Sample Non-PETOM Responses:

1. Ask the students to answer in a sentence form.

2. Make rules regarding the discussions: Everyone needs to respond with at least three sentences and respond to someone else's contribution to the discussion. By providing rules to the discussion and requiring each child to participate this would help to increase the length of the answers and elaboration.

3. To improve the discussions I would try having one large group in which students raise their hands to respond to questions or answers. The reason for suggesting this is that this particular group may not work well in groups. As a group (large one), the students may respond better instead of in smaller groupings.

The data collected with the situational probes distinguished the PETOM students from non-PETOM students. This was not the case with every probe but, in general, the data indicated that the students were appropriating conceptual material featured in the program's course work. However, the faculty noted that this paper and pencil task did not reveal the students' reactions during the acts of teaching. The latter appeared to be the most critical information about the program effects and the most promising for understanding the teacher development process. In the interviews to be discussed next, the faculty found those data, and they were revealing indeed.

Interview Data

Part of PETOM's field experience required that the preservice teachers videotape themselves teaching. In interviews about their videotaped lessons, the preservice teachers began to disclose their progress through a rigorous developmental process of appropriating and applying course work concepts.

A preservice teacher describes her experience:

"Sometimes, too, when you're told things and when you actually do it, it comes out different. That's what I'm finding out, too.

428   16

They cannot always be done like how (you're told in courses) or there isn't any one best way to do something. Sometimes, too, it just depends on the situation and what's going on. It's really hard."

Although she arranged her teaching activities according to course work guidelines and recommendations, the preservice teacher found that the "situation" or the social conditions of teaching compounded the challenge. Such occasions of purposeful social activity, in Vygotsky's conception, are the basis for forming and transforming thinking. Such data from the perspective of the participant reflects the process of individual development and has the potential to inform program development and expand the knowledge base.

Another preservice teacher said:

"I don't think I really thought too much about the kind of preparation and the time it would take to do research and to absorb it and understand it enough to teach it to someone, to break it down into steps. That, I kind of had a hard time adjusting to the students' need, and how you can better move them to the point, more guided."

This statement describes the challenge that "guided" or teaching that assisted performance makes on the teacher. The preservice teacher in using terms like "adjusting to the students' need" and "how you can better move them to the point" is operationalizing her understanding of the zone of proximal development. She considers the amount of assistance the student requires based on what she believes he can do with assistance that he cannot do independently. In her words, she will "break it down into steps" in order to assist the student to the "point" or lesson goal.

Typically, the complexity of sophisticated interaction between teacher and students is camouflaged from the novice. It is in the activity itself that the challenge of assisting students to learning goals becomes crystal clear to the preservice teacher. Tharp and Gallimore emphasize that "Assisting performance through conversation requires a quite deliberate and self-controlled agenda in the mind of the teacher, who has specific curricular, cognitive, and conceptual goals" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p.5). Measures that collect data about participants' experience from their point of view during the activity of teaching produce data of use to faculties for understanding course effect and the process of teacher development.

Teacher education and professional development programs emphasizing performance assistance for linguistically and culturally diverse students, heighten preservice teachers' sensitivity and respect for their students' linguistic and cultural differences. LEP programs'

aim to assist the performance of preservice and veteran teachers by equipping teachers with appropriate strategies and techniques for effectively educating diverse students. These strategies are designed to remove many of the barriers to communication by adjusting the dynamics of teacher student interaction to be compatible with students' preferences.

Teachers' application of such strategies can be assisted through observation and feedback as well as interview. In the following interview excerpt, a preservice teacher describes her use of one strategy for discussion labelled, "talkstory" and she also describes her feelings. She says:

> "The talk story format...seems to be more comfortable, share whatever they're thinking at the moment...I like it. I don't mind it in a small group. I think I can handle it better but I know when it gets bigger, 5 is very good for me and if it gets to like 10, it gets harder to manage and I have a harder time hearing. I have to cue a lot more about I can't hear so and so talk. Somebody else is talking at the same time I have to keep cueing and reminding them about it. I can only hear so many people at a time. But I feel pretty comfortable with it. I enjoy it and I know the kids enjoy it. So it's a lot more comfortable and natural.... cause they seem to participate more. They get more excited about it and motivated."

The information from the interview data included information about teacher affect, teacher attitude toward the students, and the teacher's progress appropriating the strategy. Her discussion also revealed her use of another technique, cueing, which she was applying simultaneously with talk-story. Her facility with the "talk story" technique and her comfort level in using it indicates her progress from novice to skilled professional. This is valuable feedback for faculty and program developers.

The interviews provide rich data suggesting linkages and interactions among the program, the knowledge base, and the teacher development process. Analysis and interpretation of this data within the context of the total program evaluation holds promise for informing program development. In-depth interview data promises to reveal not only more about processes of teacher development but more about program development processes. Discovery of program's sources of influence, mechanisms of information exchange, and degree of openness to research reports and the established knowledge base is as much faculties' responsibility as the understanding of the specific effects of course work on teacher performance.

PETOM Experience Summary

The progress of this faculty through program evaluation was col-
laborative, shared and based on their common understandings about
the importance of obtaining data feedback that was useful for pro-
gram development within the program's conceptual framework.
They designed a variety of measures for examining the effect of their
own teaching and they struggled to understand the meaning of the
data generated by their measures. In collaboration, the faculty de-
signed measures for various program constituencies. In continuing
collaborative evaluation work, these measures, constituencies and
other contexts will expand in response to faculty's need to obtain use-
ful data for program development. Importantly, they were respon-
sive to evaluative feedback by redesigning their own course work and
refining program experiences.

University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC) In-Service Program Experience

In the past 20 years, teachers have seen an explosion of new
ideas and programs for improving classroom instruction. Extensive
in-service training initiatives have become the traditional vehicle for
conveying new pedagogical strategies. Unfortunately, teachers have
typically been viewed as recipients rather than as decision-makers or
active participants in staff development programs. Staff develop-
ment is often seen as "training" or "in-servicing" in which experts
teach teachers predetermined instructional methods. This raises an
evaluation question, that is, how can veteran teachers be helped to
implement new strategies for working with LEP students?

The body of research on in-service training indicates certain
characteristics that make it more effective and calls for new ways of
looking at retraining teachers. The work of Glickman suggests that
teachers need not be trained but rather be given the tools for deter-
mining their own instructional priorities. Components that allow
teachers to work together and make decisions about planning, imple-
menting, and evaluating instruction (Glickman, 1990) are highly de-
sirable. He found teachers became more thoughtful and resourceful
about teaching.

Teacher education and in-servicing strategies such as peer coach-
ing, simulations, demonstrations, performance feedback, interactive
journals, and mentoring are currently receiving attention in the lit-
erature. These in-service strategies and recent programs like
teacher induction enhance the opportunity for professional develop-
ment within the social, interactive context of teaching activity. Al-

19

though teacher induction programs vary in their design, the overall goals of these programs have been to provide ongoing support and assistance to beginning teachers as they enter the profession, to improve teacher effectiveness, to increase retention in the profession and to promote the professional and personal well-being of new teachers.

Veenman (1984) suggested that novice teachers need both pedagogical assistance and psychological support. This is similar to recommendations from developmental theorists such as Furth (1981) and Vygotsky (1978). They point out that a supportive atmosphere is necessary if learners need to master new and complex thought and action.

As Gherke points out, traditional quantitative methods are inappropriate for trying to understand these relationships. Recent evaluation reports about induction programs suggest that useful data regarding teacher networking, nurturing relationships and complexities of teacher development are available through qualitative methods (Gherke, 1988).

UCSC/Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project

Based on research recommendations on effective in-service training, the University of California/Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project designed an interactive, collaborative program for new teacher support, staff development, and professional growth for veteran teachers. A program titled, the Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project was developed in 1988 by the University of California at Santa Cruz Teacher Education Program in collaboration with the Santa Cruz County Office of Education and seven school districts in the county. In this consortium, communication and collaboration occurred across districts and institutional boundaries. The consortium members determined program philosophy, components, and ongoing evaluation.

During its first three years the project has served 155 first year K-8 teachers with 105 teaching in bilingual classes; 78 of these teachers are graduates of the UCSC Teacher Preparation Program. The Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project supports beginning teachers' efforts to translate what they have learned in their preservice preparation into classroom practice. After nearly three years, the Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project has lost only five of the 155 teachers served.

In this project, the evaluation component was designed by program faculty.and included both quantitative and qualitative methods. Measures, listed in Appendix B, such as standardized interviews, questionnaires, journal entries, videotape feedback, advisor

logs, self-assessment forms and weekly observations were systemati-
cally used by all project participants. The faculty reviewed data and
responded to feedback at weekly meetings of the bilingual advisors
and the director. For three years, the program development was
guided by evaluation data. What follows is a description of the
project and an overview of the findings.

The project serves seven school districts in Santa Cruz County
which is a rapidly growing area with an ethnically and linguistically
diverse student population of about 33,000 K-12 students. The
Pajaro Valley Unified School District, the largest in the county, is
one of the most linguistically impacted in California with 40 percent
of its students being limited-English proficient. Ninety-four percent
of these LEP students are Spanish speaking, and of this group, 77
percent are migrant.

The Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project (SCCNTP), one of
37 pilot projects of the California New Teacher Project, is funded by
the State Department of Education and the Commission on Teacher
Credentialing. Five exemplary bilingual teachers -- Novice Teacher
Advisors -- are the cornerstone of the Santa Cruz County New
Teacher Project. The advisors, who specialize in all aspects of bilin-
gual-multicultural education, are hired to work with new teachers
for the entire year under the guidance of a UCSC Project Director.

The advisors, whose case load was fourteen bilingual teachers,
worked with each new teacher two hours per week both in and out of
the classroom setting. The advisors' time in the class was spent do-
ing demonstration lessons in both English and Spanish particularly
in language and literacy, observing and coaching, assessing students,
videotaping lessons, providing release time, responding to interactive
journals, and assisting with problems as they arose. Time outside
the classroom was spent on planning, gathering bilingual and cultur-
ally relevant resources, problem solving and reflection, and general
support and encouragement. By being familiar with the students in
the class, the overall curriculum plan, and the class structure and
organization, the advisor was able to provide new teachers with con-
text specific assistance.

The overall philosophy of the project is that teaching is complex
(Good and Brophy; Shavelson, 1983) and that the process of becom-
ing a teacher involves career-long or life-long learning. The project
recognizes that new teachers enter the profession at different devel-
opmental stages and with individual needs. In a non-evaluative and
supportive manner, the advisors help each new teacher develop an
individualized plan to address their specific goals and needs. From
week to week the advisor and the new teacher work together to
strengthen the new teacher's program with the advisor responding to
the new teacher's zone of proximal development. Each new teacher

is a member of a team which includes the advisor, the peer resource, and the site principal.

In addition to the ongoing coaching, new teachers received five days of staff development training aimed at meeting the identified needs of the new teacher and their LEP students. The first in-service on classroom management and organization emphasized cooperative learning strategies and heterogeneous groupings. The second inservice on Language Development addressed first- and second-language acquisition, strategies for creating natural language opportunities, methods for integrating language into all areas of the curriculum, and thematic planning. The Reading/Writing Connection focused on ways to create a biliterate learning environment, rich in print and conversation.

The data collected following each session was positive. It indicated that the new teachers felt that they had received information which was immediately applicable and manageable within their first-year context. The weekly coaching that followed supported new teachers in their efforts to acquire new strategies. Two days of re-lease time were spent with the advisor observing exemplary bilingual teachers, discussing the observations, and planning curriculum. A monthly seminar series provided an opportunity for networking and reflection.

Evaluation

As a result of their intensive involvement, the advisors developed a unique and powerful collegial relationship with each of their new teachers. Both midyear and end of the year evaluations from the new teachers used such descriptors as "saint," "guardian angel," "friend, and "co-teacher" to describe this relationship. When given an opportunity to describe the most beneficial aspect of their work with the advisor, new teachers,(male and female/ages ranging from 22-50) consistently emphasized emotional support. When new teachers in the Santa Cruz project were asked "Who has been helpful in dealing with the challenges you've faced?" the New Teacher Project was the most frequently named source of support (Drury, 1991). The level of enthusiasm for the project increased throughout the year with teachers repeatedly attesting to the value of the help they received from their advisors and other project personnel.

New teachers and their advisors kept an ongoing interactive journal. The journal entries present the types of questions new teachers pose, the frustrations they face, and the depth of the relationship between the advisor and the advisee. The following excerpt from a third grade bilingual teacher shows her taking charge of her own professional development. "For our next meeting I'd like to meet after school, if possible, to plan a math schedule like you

showed us at the in-service. I'd like to bring in some other strands from the math framework like your model does. It is obvious to me that many of the students need additional opportunities for hands on activities."

A second grade bilingual teacher wrote: "I haven't been happy with my writing program. I had great plans at the beginning of the year. I guess where it bogged down was with my frustration with trying to attend to each student's writing needs. It wasn't possible for me to get around individually and actually do much teaching. Because I was disturbed by all these factors I tended to avoid writing, especially revision and editorial stages. Maybe you could demonstrate a writing lesson for me sometime."

After the demonstration lesson he wrote: "I loved the writing lesson. This is exactly what I've been missing, some motivating material to be creative with. They really do need some motivating structure to bounce off from. I guess its asking too much for them to create from a vacuum, which I often have done. As beginning writers, they need to play with vocabulary in this way, one step at a time. I also read your comments on their papers. Makes me see how infrequently I give positive feedback. It's so easy to write "fantastic idea." Why don't I do it more?"

The project director and the advisor had regular contact with the site principals. The principals' perspective about the SCCNTP was collected through both interviews and questionnaires. All of the 30 principals interviewed clearly felt that the most important part of the project was the weekly classroom visits by the advisor. One of the participating elementary principals spoke to the program's effects:

"The project is supporting new teachers in all the ways that principals would like to but never have the time to do. When I compare the first year teachers of previous years to this year's new teachers, it's apparent to me that this group is much further along in developing their programs. In less than a year, they are doing what it took other teachers three years to accomplish. I attribute this to the close working relationship with the veteran teacher."

These quotes from principals strongly suggest that nurturant relationships within classroom contexts support teacher growth. The advisors' years of experience in bilingual classrooms and their training enabled them to diagnose problems, provide options, and allow the new teachers to remain in control of decision making while being extremely sensitive to the developmental needs of each new teacher.

Again, a principal at a middle school stated: "We saw more growth in our first year teachers than we have ever seen before. By

23

working as a team with a veteran teacher, they are giving the kids in those classrooms a far better education than they would get if that link wasn't there."

One of the unanticipated benefits to veteran teachers at the school site was the spillover effect of the collegiality and collaboration being modeled by the new teacher and the new teacher advisor. When 50 new teachers were asked, "What effect, if any has the New Teacher Project had on your staff?" all but five noted a positive change. The responses included increased networking and sharing of resources, a willingness to share ideas and strategies, a more professional staff, an openness to new ideas; individual staff members have been rejuvenated and motivated to rethink strategies, innovative methods are spreading throughout the school, greater respect for new teachers, and more sensitive to the demands and pressures of first year teachers. Ten of the teachers mentioned that veteran teachers at their school sites often approached them or their advisors to be a part of their sharing or to receive copies of resources the advisors brought. This gave new teachers a boost in self-esteem as they could now be givers rather than always "takers." One new teacher stated in May, "It seemed like the veteran teachers used to run away whenever they saw me coming. But as I've acquired new materials and teaching strategies they often ask about my new ideas. I don't feel like a parasite any longer."

The advisors in the SCCNTP received extensive staff development training in cognitive coaching, clinical supervision, communication skills, the needs and developmental stages of new teachers, and effective strategies for working with LEP students. As part of the evaluation component, the advisors were asked to describe what they'd learned in their two years of working with the project. What follows are examples highlighting the reoccurring themes that emerged.

I feel a particular benefit from all I have learned about questioning as a means to help teachers think about their teaching and consciously control it through their own decision making. I think that the non-evaluative nature of my relationship with new teachers has allowed me to freely explore the possibilities of novice-veteran teacher interactions. We didn't have to prove anything together. This experience has caused me to develop a better understanding of the dynamics of change as it applies to teachers.

Participating in this Project has me fully convinced that the flourishing of the profession will depend in a large part on the opening of our doors to our peers and that teachers must control the process. It can't be done to them.

By seeing so many different ways to make teaching work I have become more accepting of differences in style and approach. We teach a diverse student population yet I had fallen into the pattern of seeing a few instructional approaches and teaching styles as "best." I have learned that you have to begin with a relationship and then you have the opportunity to dig deeper through questioning to arrive at a closer understanding of the educational decision making that went into creating a learning activity. It is then that you begin a professional dialogue, not with the purpose of persuasion but with an invitation for a thought provoking exchange -- and with this kind of empowerment comes change.

When I faced a problem in helping a new teacher, I could always problem solve with the team of advisors. Together we came up with questioning strategies and new approaches that enabled us and the new teacher to understand better. We were able to "shadow" one another in pairs, peer coaching each other at work with a new teacher. As a member of this collegial network of peers, I was able to grow in my own teaching.

As a member of a team of experienced teachers, working together to support new teachers, I had weekly opportunities to brainstorm, problem solve, share professional expertise and resources with my peers. We felt respected for our talents, skills, strengths, and even for our areas of weakness. Our director always consulted members of the team in decision making and she was able to keep the dialogue open and constructive on a regular basis. This freedom and openness empowered us to take responsibility for our own professionalism. I attribute the success we had in supporting new teachers to this feeling of safety in the community we created among ourselves.

This project is also externally evaluated. The Southwest Regional Laboratory is completing a three year evaluation study of the California New Teacher Project. Preliminary findings conclude that in addition to dramatically affecting retention, high intensity support efforts as provided by the Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project also greatly enhance teacher performance, especially in the area of multicultural education and working effectively with diverse populations. SWRL has also found a positive relationship between the level of support offered to new teachers and the amount of time new teachers actually engage their students in academic learning tasks. In fact, those new teachers who had high intensity support came close to providing as much academically engaged time for their students as do experienced teachers. New teachers in the high intensity models, where they received support and training, reported that the CNTP was important to their success.

Although these quantitative data gathered by SWRL have been valuable, another kind of data was also needed. We needed to study

the relationship between the advisor and the advisee in an effort to understand the kinds of interactions that support growth and development in new teachers. Upon reviewing the interactive journals, the advisors were eager to try alternative approaches and/or modify their support based on new teacher needs. The qualitative data in these journals and interviews highlighted the different developmental stages that new teachers go through as well as the type of assistance they sought throughout the year. The advisors had some work to do on their own acceptance and tolerance.

Program responsiveness also extended to the role of the advisors. Most advisors began with the attitude that teachers teach in similar ways with similar methods. In reality, diversity permeated the entire program including evaluation -- different teaching styles, with teachers at different developmental stages, advisors with varying levels of knowledge regarding coaching and biliteracy strategies, principals with different styles and seven districts with different priorities. This openness or embracing of diversity was the heart of the evaluation process. This diversity is illustrated by the questions that continually emerged. How can we help new teachers with limited Spanish who have been assigned to a bilingual class? How can we set up literature groups in a class where management is a major problem? What policy implications does our research design and data have for teacher education and in-service programs? These questions were best answered by collegial teams that gave teachers opportunities to take control of their own professional development and to create non-judgmental strategies for sharing strengths and weakness.

New teachers in the project opened their class up to weekly observation without fear or intimidation. By building the new teachers into the evaluation design, their talents and professional status were acknowledged. This participatory model of evaluation means not "doing evaluation to" program participants but including them in all aspects of the design, implementation, analysis, evaluation and programmatic modification.

Fifth Recommendation

Our fifth recommendation follows from the participatory evaluation used in both the Hawaii and California programs: Engage program participants in program evaluation design. Collaboration on evaluation design produces useful, substantive data that validate program operations and stimulates program responsiveness. A participatory model of evaluation means bringing program participants into the evaluation process from its inception.

26

UCSC/Santa Cruz County
  New Teacher Project Summary

The collegial team that was established among all the partici-
pants, advisors, new teachers, principals, peer resource, faculty and
the director, allowed for and encouraged an open forum for dialogue,
continuous reflection, and evaluation. The program focused on advi-
sors being sensitive to the Vygotskian principles in working with
new teachers. The multi-modal evaluation with interviews, ques-
tionnaires, interactive journals, advisor logs, videotaping, and self-
assessment forms were directed toward the constant rethinking and
enhancement of the program. Participants viewed the evaluation
process as a positive opportunity for professional growth. When the
project began in 1988 little was known about the needs of new teach-
ers. It has been through the participation of this collegial team in
the evaluation process that we have gained in-depth awareness and
insights into the experiences of new teachers serving LEP student
populations. New questions arise and the process of evaluation con-
tinues.

Summary of Recommendations for Evaluating
LEP Preservice and In-Service Programs

In this paper, the teacher education program evaluation litera-
ture, the findings of recent research on effective teaching and learn-
ing models for linguistic minorities, and the experiences of two pro-
grams, one preservice and one in-service, have been discussed. In
both programs, a wide range of data were collected in an exploratory
manner capturing the perspectives of many of the participants. The
programs' evaluation designs sought data about process level issues
as well as competency based teacher performance exploring the rela-
tionship between what programs actually do with the knowledge
base and how teachers develop. Both programs depended on this
evaluation data to refine operations and proceeded in a collaborative,
activity based manner.

The experiences of these evaluated programs though clearly still
evolving reinforce many recommendations in the literature. Build-
ing on the literature, the experiences of both programs, and effective
teaching and learning strategies for LEP students, we conclude with
five recommendations presented as follows and in Appendix A:

27

Recommendations for Evaluation of LEP Preservice and In-Service Teacher Education Programs

1. Identify and document LEP teacher education and in-service programs using program evaluation.

2. Identify and document program responsiveness to evaluation feedback. Evaluation methodology designed to yield relevant, substantive, and useful information for program developers and faculty is most likely to result in program responsiveness to feedback.

3. Use broad based methods and measures to obtain multiple perspectives on LEP teacher education program experience and effect particularly those of the specific communities, cultures, and constituencies served.

4. Design LEP teacher education program evaluation to examine programmatic features important to language development and program responsiveness to new knowledge in the field.

5. Engage program participants in program evaluation design. Collaboration on evaluation design produces useful, substantive data that validates program operations and stimulates program responsiveness. A participatory model of evaluation means bringing program participants into the evaluation process from its inception.

Given the dearth of evaluation activity in LEP teacher training and in-service and the crisis the nation faces in addressing the needs of linguistic minorities, program evaluation demands prioritization. At this time, the linkage between the expanded knowledge about effective education for LEP students and teacher education program development is unclear. Additionally, the relationship between what programs actually do and how teachers develop in them is unreported. The effect of program operations, teacher development processes, and program's linkage to knowledge base are integral sources of information and influence for programs committed to improving teaching practice for LEP students. We need to know much more about these processes and program evaluation as one means to this goal.

Evaluation can be a systematic and regular practice that is an essential component of the program development process, well worth the resources required. By engaging in self-examination, programs themselves enter a developmental process, learning as they teach.

2ธ

Appendix A

PETOM Evaluation Measures

- Checklists for rating performance competence of the PETOM preservice teachers and controls

- Demographic profiles of ethnicity, age, grade point average, and place of birth

- Preservice teacher interviews about program experience

- Cooperating Teacher interviews

- Rating scales

- Principals' Interviews

- Situational Probes to discriminate between PETOM students and the control group for competence in program emphases such as language development and the use of culturally compatible teaching strategies

- Open Ended Stimulated Recall Interviews about preservice teachers' experiences in the activity of teaching

PETOM Principal's Interview Excerpt

The PETOM graduates "...are very enthusiastic and always willing to leam. They have a good knowledge base and are well equipped with effective teaching strategies although, being new teachers, they are still having difflculties applying them.

They are middle-class teachers dealing with low-income, severely at-risk youngsters, and this is an incredibly hard task. Therefore, they have had to make a lot of adjustments this first year and, in many ways, they are not yet fully equipped. I look at these teachers as slowly evolving, and in two more years they will be top-notch. But, they are never frustrated or depressed. They are lovely people who are trying hard and maintaining very good attitudes despite the many obstacles that working with deprived youngsters brings.

Working on the Leeward Coast is always a very frustrating experience for very new teachers because most of them have not had the hands-on time with these kinds of kids. They have to first experiment with, and weed through a multitude of teaching strategies before finding those that are most effective. These strategies must ad-

dress all kinds of kids and not just those found at Kamehameha Schools or in town. Most young teachers have not had enough field experience in this area, and it would really help if they spent time out here before graduating from school. ...I think your program is wonderful, but your graduates need to spend more time in areas such as this before they can be truly competent new teachers. These teachers are growing this year and they are always willing to learn. I am sure they will evolve into first-rate teachers."

Appendix B

University of California at Santa Cruz Measures

- Standardized Interviews

- Questionnaires

- Journals

- Videotape Feedback,

- Advisor Logs

- Self-assessment

- Weekly observations were systematically used by all project participants.

University of California at Santa Cruz
New Teacher Project

Examples of
Program Responsiveness to Evaluation

Based on the data from the first year, the program modified its support to new teachers. The First Year Orientation, focusing heavily on planning, classroom management and bilingual curriculum development was revised to be sensitive to the developmental, needs of new teachers.

In response to data indicating new teachers' increased need for support, the project recruited exemplary, bilingual teachers who could combine their expertise in teaching with nonjudgemental, supportive interpersonal skills.

Based on feedback from new teachers, the seminar series dramatically changed over the three years. Seminars moved from a curriculum emphasis to an open forum, enhancing networking, collaboration, and problem solving.

Advisors began by expecting teachers to teach in similar ways with similar methods. They became responsive to different teaching styles, teachers at different developmental stages, principals with different styles, and seven districts with different priorities.

References

Diaz, R.M. (1983). The impact of bilingualism on cognitive development. In E.W. Gordon (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 23-54). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Drury, R. (1991). Is there life after school? The experience of novice teachers in the Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California at Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA.

Gallimore, R., & Goldenberg, C. (in press). Activity settings of early literacy: Home and school factors in children's emergent literacy. In E. Forman, N. Minick, and C.A. Stone (Eds.), Education and mind: The integration of institutional, social, and developmental processes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Galluzzo, G. R. & Craig, J. R. (1990). Evaluation of preservice teacher education programs. In W. Houston (Ed.) Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Garcia, E. (1988, Winter). Effective schooling for language minority students. New Focus, (No. 1). (Available from the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education)

Garcia, E. (1990). Educating teachers for language minority students. In W. Houston (Ed.) Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 717-729). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Garcia, E. (1991). The education of linguistically and culturally diverse students: Effective instructional practices (Working paper). Center for Study of Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Gherke, N. (1988). Toward a definition of mentoring. Theory into Practice, 27(3), 190-194.

Glickman, C.D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1987). Looking in classrooms (4th ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Hakuta, K. (1986). Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism. New York: Basic Books.

Katz, L., Raths, J., Mohanty, C. Kurachi, A., & Irving, J. (1981). Follow-up studies: Are they worth the trouble. Journal of Teacher Education, 32(2), 18-24.

Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.

McLauglin, B. (1990) Development of bilingualism: Myth and reality. In A. Barona and E. Garcia (Eds.), Children at risk: Poverty, minority status and other issues in educational equality (pp. 65-76). Washington, D.C.: National Association of School Psychologists.

Medley, D.M. (1977). Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, DC.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 143 629)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1987). Standards for the accreditation of teacher education. Washington DC: Author.

Native Hawaiian Educational Assessment Project Final Report. (1983). [Executive summary]. U.S. Department of Education: The Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate.

Note, M. (1989). Qualitative and quantitative approaches to a preservice teacher education program evaluation. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Manoa, HI.

Phillips, M. & Glickman, C. (1991). Peer Coaching: Developmental approach to enhancing teacher thinking. Journal of Staff Development, 12(2), 20-25.

Picard, A.J. & Young, D.B. (1990, September). Methods: teaching and learning principles. The Kamehameha Journal of Education, 1.

Ramirez, J.D., Yuen, S.D., & Ramey, D.R. (1991). <u>Final report: Lon-
gitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-
exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for
language-minority children</u>. (Contract No. 300-87-0156). Wash-
ington, DC: Department of Education.

Sandefur, J.T. (1970). <u>An illustrated model for the evaluation of
teacher education graduates</u>. Washington, DC: American Asso-
ciation of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Shavelson, R.J. (1983). Review of research on teachers' pedagogical
judgments, plans, and decisions. <u>The Elementary School Jour-
nal</u>, <u>83</u>(4), 392-413.

Showers, B. (1982). <u>Transfer of learning: The contributions of
coaching</u>. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for Educa-
tional Policy and Management.

Speidel, G.E. (1990, September). How is PETOM viewed by its
graduates? <u>The Kamehameha Journal of Education, 1</u>.

Tharp R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). <u>Rousing minds to life</u>. New York:
Cambridge University Press.

Tharp R., & Gallimore, R. (1989). Rousing schools to life. <u>American
Educator</u>.

Tikunoff, W. & Ward, B. (1991, April). <u>Competencies of teachers of
ethnolinguistically diverse student groups</u>. Paper presented at
the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Asso-
ciation, Chicago, Il.

Troyer, M.E. & Pace, C.R. (1944). <u>Evaluation in teacher education</u>.
Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. <u>Re-
view of Educational Research</u>, 54(2), 143-178.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). <u>Mind in society</u>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
University Press.

Wong-Fillmore, Lily (in press). When learning a second language
means losing the first. <u>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</u>.

Response to Dalton and Moir's Presentation

Lynn Malarz
Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development, Virginia

As an educator very interested in professional development and bilingual education, I would like to compliment the authors on their papers and the research that went into writing them. It is an honor to be a discussant and be part of this symposium.

First, let me make a few brief comments about the paper, then I would like to expand on certain aspects of the paper that research has shown to be important components of teacher training. I wholeheartedly agree with the authors that teacher training programs in general are not widely evaluated and it is very unfortunate that the evaluation of LEP teacher training and in-service programs is so neglected at a time when so many states are begging for bilingual teachers. For example, in its August newsletter, the California Administrators Association stated that at the beginning of this year the state would be short 14,000 bilingual teachers.

I can further say that I do not disagree with any of the points that the authors have made in their papers; the papers presented many pertinent issues regarding teacher education. Thus, I invite you to walk down another path with me, one that will expand on parts of the training I see as very crucial components in teacher training. If it is true, as David Berliner (1984) states, that teaching is a constant stream of decisions, and any teacher behavior used is the result of a decision, either conscious or unconscious, then as educators working with teachers, we need to understand how to help teachers make the decision that will promote maximum student learning. By looking at the work of many researchers in the field of education, such as David Berliner Teacher "Executive Processes," Madeline Hunter "Teaching as Decision Making," Robert Goldhammer "Clinical Supervision," Art Costa and Bob Garmston "Cognitive coaching," and many more, (the authors referred to advisers being in-serviced in the cognitive coaching model as well as others), we can begin to understand how an individual can become an autonomous teacher -- teachers who:

- Act With Intentionality
- Generate and Choose from Alternatives
- Use Precise Language
- Take Responsibility
- Monitor, Reflect Upon, and Learn From Experience

- Align Behaviors with Values
- Activate Community

Let's look at Profiling the Teacher (see Appendix A) and the myriad of components that go into the profile. By looking at this, it can be said that "Effective supervision is defined as a set of strategies designed to enhance the teacher's perceptions, decision, and intellectual functions," (Costa, p.17, 1991).

Following are some ways to work with beginning teachers as well as veteran teachers to help enhance their intellectual skills, which contribute to educationally sound decision making.

1. Cognitive Coaching, which I have eluded to, is one way. It is a way that supervisors, advisors, coaches and others can work with teachers to help them with the coaching functions in the four phases of the instructional process (see Appendix A).

2. Peer Coaching is another method that has been shown to increase collegiality and improve teaching. Peer coaching is a confidential process through which teachers share their expertise and provide one another with feedback, support, and assistance for the purpose of refining present skills, learning new skills, and/or solving classroom-related problems.

Any type of coaching system has preconditions that should be considered before implementing the program, such as:

There must be a general perception on the part of the people involved that they are good but can always get better; they can always improve what they are doing. This general orientation has been found to characterize effective schools.

The teachers and administrators involved must have reasonable level of trust; they must be confident that no one is going to distort the situation in any way.

There must be an interpersonal climate in the school that conveys the sense that people care about each other and are willing to help one another.

Research has also shown that to have meaningful staff development -- programs that become institutionalized -- schools need to have teachers participate in ways that ensure transfer of learning (see Appendix A). Further benefits of coaching programs have also been documented:

- Better understanding of teaching
- Improved self-analysis skills

35

- Improved sense of professional skill
- Renewal and recognition
- Increased sense of efficacy
- Increased collaboration/collegiality
- Improved teaching performance
- Increased student growth/development

Now one can ask, "what is the purpose to all this?" I know it has been verbalized these last few days at this symposium, but let me again state what I feel is necessary in bilingual education -- teachers need to increase their responses to students that will support and extend student thinking and learning. By helping teachers learn different strategies (cognitive coaching, peer coaching, etcetera.), higher order thinking skills can be attained.

Research has found the manner in which teachers respond to students has great influence on the student. Different researchers have documented (Lowrey, 1990) that the way teachers respond has a greater influence on students' thinking than what the teacher asks or tells them to do. Students are constantly anticipating how their teachers will respond to their actions. Thus, the way teachers respond to students seems to exert greater influence than the teachers' questioning. It has also been found that teachers' responses have a great deal of influence on the development of students' self-concept, their attitude toward learning, their achievement, and their classroom rapport.

Let me quickly review response behaviors of teachers -- teacher initiated questions and directions that elicit thinking and learning (See Appendix A).

Last, I would agree with the authors that teacher training and in-service needs systematic and regular evaluation. My hope would be that more programs not only have approaches and processes similar to UCSC/Santa Cruz County New Teacher Project and the University of Hawaii's Preservice Education for Teachers of Minorities but also incorporate the research that is constantly emerging on higher order thinking skills. Skills that can enhance a student's learning; skills that will help the student become a life-long learner. The Greeks had a word for it: Paideia:

A society in which learning, fulfillment, and becoming human are the primary goals and all its institutions are directed toward that end. The Athenians designed their society to bring all its members to the fullest development of their highest powers. They were educated by their culture -- by Paideia. Self-development and the promotion of lifelong learning is the "central project" of society.

36

449

Appendix A

<div style="border:1px solid">

THE MANNER IN WHICH TEACHERS

RESPOND TO STUDENTS HAS GREAT

INFLUENCE ON THE STUDENT.

</div>

<div style="border:1px solid">

TEACHERS NEED TO ENHANCE COGNITIVE

LEVELS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION.

</div>

Gathering and Recalling Information (Input)

To cause the student to input data, questions and statements are designed to draw from the student the concepts, information, feelings or experiences acquired in the past and stored in long or short term memory.

Some verbs that may serve as the predicate of a behavioral objective statement are:

completing	matching
counting	naming
defining	observing
describing	reciting
identifying	selecting
listing	scanning

Questions:

"How does the picture make you feel?" Describing

"The Mexican houses were made of
mud bricks called what?" Completing

37

Making Sense Out of Information Gathering (Processing)

To cause the student to PROCESS the data gathered through the senses and retrieve from long- or short-term memory.

Examples:

synthesizing	categorizing
analyzing	explaining
classifying	grouping
comparing	inferring
contrasting	making analogies
distinguishing	organizing
experimenting	sequencing

Questions:

"Compare the strength of steel to the strength of copper."	Comparing
"How can you arrange the rocks in the order of their size?"	Sequencing
"How are pine needles different from redwood needles?"	Contrasting

Raising Questions to Higher Levels

Input	Processing	Output
1. How many of you are buying milk today?	Why are you buying milk today? Are there more students in Mr. Jones' room than in ours who are buying milk? Why are there fewer milk buyers in our room?	What do you think would happen if nobody bought milk anymore? What do you think would happen if all the children in the world had all the milk they needed? Could you give some examples of countries where this is the case?

38

2. What was the weather like yesterday?

How does the weather today compare to the weather yesterday?

Why is our weather so different today?

How does the weather in Washington, DC compare with the weather in Tokyo?

What do you think the weather will be like tomorrow?

What can you say about cities which have weather like ours?

A Model of Intellectual Functioning

Input	Processing	Output
Intake of data through the senses	Making sense out of the data	Applying and Evaluating
Recalling from both short- and long-term memory		Metacognition

39

Response to Dalton and Noir's Presentation

Victoria Jew
California State University, Sacramento

The focus of my discussion will be on Recommendation Four: that we design teacher preparation program evaluation to examine programmatic features that are important to the development of the candidates and that we examine a program's responsiveness to new knowledge. I think that we need to focus on two areas of this recommendation because of the nature of this particular field: one is training resiliency because of the school sites that our bilingual education candidate will eventually work in, the other is the responsiveness to the changing demographics of the LEP students -- this is in addition to the general responsiveness to the emergence of new knowledge.

Let me focus on the first point: the condition under which our candidates ultimately have to teach. Bilingual education, as we all know, is still a controversial field. It is controversial because of the specific characteristics of the knowledge base, the population it serves, and the broader social and political climate under which the education of limited English proficient students operates. This condition still exists in a lot of the school settings in which our students will eventually work.

Our graduates are often placed in non-nurturing or even hostile school environments because bilingual education and other approaches to teaching limited English proficient students force schools to address language and culture issues and because they elevate the needs of non-mainstream students into an educational priority at these school sites.

To add to this condition is the controversial nature of our knowledge base. Although we have a substantial knowledge base about language development and effective practices for LEP students, a substantial body of this knowledge is controversial because it may be contrary to the belief system of the school culture of the sites in which our graduates will have to work. Whereas in non-controversial areas of this knowledge base, training programs can merely address the program design in terms of effective implementation, such as: assisting the candidates in developing a professional perspective or working on their competency to bridge theory and practice. But in controversial areas, we really need to address additional program design features to look at the effect of training when it comes into contact with a hostile or non-nurturing environment.

Let me give you some examples about the nature of the body of knowledge that I am referring to. If you are looking at sheltered English, whether you are looking at its theoretical and philosophical perspective or its approach and strategies, it is not controversial. So in training, it is something that can probably be dealt with by employing regular measures for increasing the effectiveness of training. I suspect language choice for instruction in a multilingual classroom will be just as non-controversial. But if you are to look at approaches such as substantive and substantial use of the primary language for instruction, criteria for transition, or language maintenance, then you will run into areas where the specific school culture might be completely not in congruence with the knowledge base in which the new bilingual teacher has been trained. Another area of the knowledge base that was mentioned in the paper: I can more or less predict that the work Lily Wong Fillmore is doing right now that warns of the harmful effects of early English immersion for young children will be controversial when it gets to a school setting.

Let me share with you one of my greatest frustration as a teacher trainer which is also the frustration many of us in teacher training share. We prepare bilingual teachers who appear to be well-trained as they complete the training progra᛭ ᵢ. They appear to have at least a well defined philosophical perspective; they have developed a sound professional perspective; they show beginning level of competency in methodology, strategy, and practice that are effective in classrooms for LEP students. But within two years after graduation, when we visit them in their teaching setting, a good number of these former students whom we have trained look no different from others at the site who have not been trained. They have become socialized into this particular environment, and we see little sign of the training they have received.

For some of these students, the rhetoric of bilingual education remains, but there is no reflection of that particular perspective in their classroom practices. Others completely abandon what they have gained in the training program and look just like everyone else. Still others even work against their training, using the knowledge base they were trained in to attack bilingual education. I am wondering, for those who have abandoned the skills that they developed when they were faced with a hostile environment, whether the design of a training program can focus on preparing the candidates to face the special kind of challenge that bilingual educators often have to face: the lack of support, the lack of material, the lack of commitment, the lack of resources and the lack of status in schools.

Some of the enhancement of the candidates can be addressed when you look at how we bridge theory and practice, how we assist students in practice teaching, how we coach students. But there are other areas that need something more than these types of improve-

ment in training. Therefore, I really think that data needs to be collected to explore ways in which the process of teacher development can incorporate the kind of training and support that would enhance the resiliency for the special kind of knowledge base that we work from; the belief system and the commitment to an effective education for language minority students with which a training program prepares, trains, and empowers bilingual educators.

The second area I want to give focus to is the responsiveness to new knowledge. Within the consideration for new knowledge, we need to consider responsiveness to the changing demographics of the LEP student population in schools. We need to evaluate how effectively training programs continue to modify programs as they collect data about emerging populations of LEP students. Let me give you some examples of the kind of frustration that we have in the field of bilingual teacher training, particularly in the training of teachers for working with Asian-Pacific language populations. There is an absolute dearth of data or research on this particular population in terms of bilingual education or second language education in the U.S. This is also true for any language other than Spanish. In many ways, a lot of us, who are working in training programs that train for other languages, experience a tremendous amount of difficulties in presenting data that can be considered robust.

In addition, there is a certain degree of what may be considered capriciousness in the way we determine what is generalizable or not generalizable to other LEP populations from the data we have about Spanish speaking students. Some of us are quite surprised by the type of interpretation that others in bilingual education render when it comes to non Spanish languages. One example, for instances, is the question of literacy transferability. In California, there has always been a focus on the extent of transferability of literacy between L1 and L2. This is all well and fine for two languages such as Spanish and English, not very distant in many ways. Then when you have candidates in training who are from other language backgrounds, including those from languages with extremely different orthographies such as Chinese, the capricious manner in which one trainer determines that there is zero transferability and another determines to claim extensive transferability without any attention to the obvious differences can be most confusing.

Another recent surprise is the Summary of the Longitudinal Study by Ramirez in which a statement was made that the results of the study cannot be generalized to other language groups, because research indicated that other language background students acquire English differently. There is no body of research that we are aware of about how other language groups acquire English. Given the lack of data for interpretation, this statement in the summary again is open to capricious interpretation that can be both surprising to

people who are speakers of these languages and confusing to candidates in training.

Finally, we really need to start to take a look at how we can continue to incorporate a pluralistic perspective in the way we train bilingual teachers. A lot of the paradigms for training or in classroom practices in bilingual education or in language development education have been set based on the experiences, practices, and data of the Spanish-speaking population. Thus, our programs need to give focus to evaluation that examines how well we continue to include and how well we continue to change in order to address changing demographics.

43