

Collaborative Video Inquiry as Teacher Educator Professional Development

**Laura Baecher
& Shiao-Chuan Kung**

Hunter College, City University of New York

University-based teacher educators across the U.S. have become increasingly focused on making their practices relevant to the needs of teacher candidates (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Imig, Wiseman, & Imig, 2011; Kincheloe, 2011). To continuously examine their expertise, as a means to improve the preparation that they provide, teacher educators are engaged in a variety of approaches. These include research that examines value-added measurements of the impact of teacher education on candidates (Plecki, Elfers, & Nakamura, 2012) and self-study (Gallagher, Griffin, Ciuffetelli Parker, Kitchen, & Figg, 2011; Zeichner, 2005). Efforts also have been made among teacher educators to improve their practice in preparing teachers for students with specialized instructional needs, such as English language learners (ELLs) and those receiving special education services (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; O'Hara & Pritchard, 2008). Pugach, Blanton, and Correa (2011) emphasize the importance within teacher education of shared expertise to maximize the possibility of candidates' being ready to address the needs of a range of learners. Although one of the most readily available means for teacher education

Laura Baecher is an assistant professor of TESOL in the School of Education and Shiao-Chuan Kung is an educational technologist with the Technology, Teaching, and Learning Group of the Office of Instructional Computing and Information Technology, both at Hunter College of the City University of New York, New York City, New York. Their e-mail addresses are lbaecher@hunter.cuny.edu & skung@hunter.cuny.edu

faculty to develop their capacity to prepare teachers for all learners is collaborative, interdisciplinary dialogue, this rarely occurs in higher education settings (Tierney, 1997; Young, 2011).

In this study, we explored how collaborative video analysis among faculty peers across program disciplines served as a form of teacher educator professional development. At the college where this research took place, all teacher candidates video record and submit a clip of their teaching to an online video library. Although faculty members had individually reviewed these videos of teaching, video analysis of teaching among groups of faculty had not yet taken place. Based on its success in teacher candidate learning (e.g., Hennessy & Deaney, 2009; Van Es & Sherin, 2010; Welsch & Devlin, 2007), we used collaborative video analysis as a tool for teacher educator faculty development. Our inquiry was guided by three questions:

1. What did faculty independently attend to in their analysis of videos of teaching?
2. What was the content of the faculty conversations about the videos of teaching?
3. How did faculty view participation in these conversations?

Professional Development for Teacher Educators

Perhaps because teacher educators are positioned as providers rather than as recipients of professional learning, they are less often its beneficiaries. Organizational dilemmas, both structural and cultural within teacher education, hinder faculty from obtaining professional development. One persistent dilemma originates in the lack of a mentoring process for new faculty (Hiebert & Morris, 2009). Ball, Sleep, Boerst, and Bass (2009) found that new teacher educators had little access to veteran faculty and, therefore, had to both develop and teach their curriculum. Other researchers, particularly in the area of self-study of teaching education, have documented this phenomenon as a means both to understand and to recognize that the work of teacher education is not self-evident but must be continuously examined (Cuenca, 2010; Dinkelman, 2003).

Another dilemma arises from the organizational structures of higher education that promote individual rather than collective interests (Tierney, 1997). For professional development to take place in higher education, groups of faculty must come together around a common interest or goal and willingly share expertise in a non-competitive atmosphere. These opportunities, however, are rare. Faculty also may be concerned about devoting significant time to refining their teaching practice when,

in many institutions, greater emphasis is placed on scholarly productivity. Compensation and dedicated time are not often available for faculty development (Hahn & Lester, 2012). Teacher education faculty, in particular, carry higher teaching loads than do faculty in many other fields. They also need to balance time working with partner schools, cooperating teachers, and clinical supervisors.

A third dilemma stems from the difficulty of communicating about teaching within and across program boundaries. Teacher candidates will need to provide instruction for whole classrooms of learners by applying their knowledge of the subject matter, child and adolescent development, ELLs, and instruction for students with learning challenges; yet, their faculty have evolved into highly specialized experts. Hardman (2009) stated that this “has led to the development of separate teacher education programs with different curricula focused on knowledge and skills unique to each disciplinary perspective” (p. 583). If faculty are considered experts in their discipline areas, who will provide them with professional learning, apart from their own peers and partner faculty in other program areas? Notably, outside of departmental meetings, committee work, or official projects, faculty may not regularly meet with colleagues, especially those from outside their program areas. This has created a gap in a shared taxonomy and language for the core practices of teaching. As Grossman and McDonald (2008) stated, “The field of research on teaching still lacks powerful ways of parsing teaching that provide us with the analytic tools to describe, analyze, and improve teaching” (p. 185).

These three dilemmas offer some insight into why professional development for teacher education faculty is an area in need of greater attention. We necessarily turn to the body of research on classroom teacher professional development to provide parallels that are useful for teacher educators’ professional development.

The well-developed literature on effective professional development for pre- and in-service teachers has clearly emphasized several important features (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Merriam & Caffarella, 1998; Wenger, 1999). First, professional development ideally should reflect teachers’ own professional goals. If the focus is a top-down mandate and lacks relevance, it will not enjoy the “buy-in” necessary for true take-up of ideas. Teacher learning best evolves when it is “inquiry conducted by teachers (as opposed to on or with teachers)” (Nelson & Slavit, 2008, p. 100). Second, it should be an experience that provides numerous opportunities for active learning and opportunities for teachers to deepen understanding of their own practices, explore content-specific pedagogy, and attempt new approaches

to teaching in their own classroom contexts (Borko, 2004). Finally, the literature on teacher professional development is unanimous in calling for the collective participation of peers and colleagues (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). According to Fullan (2000), collaborative inquiry depends upon high levels of trust between colleagues, the ability to participate meaningfully in collaborative dialogue with a specific outcome in mind, and deep examination of classroom practice, none of which is routinely developed in teachers' daily activities and, therefore, rarely takes place (Grossman & MacDonald, 2008).

It is not a stretch to anticipate that these same principles would apply to effective teacher educator professional development. For faculty, just as for classroom teachers, collaborative inquiry could occur through inter-visitation, artifact review, or analysis of video-records of teaching. The next section concerns how video analysis of teaching within collaborative learning communities of teachers possesses many of the conditions necessary for teacher learning.

Collaborative Video Analysis of Teaching

Several studies have demonstrated how video-mediated inquiry among groups of teachers serves as a powerful form of professional development, mostly among teachers within the same discipline (Van Es & Sherin, 2010) but also across discipline areas (Baecher, Rorimer, & Smith, 2011). Video analysis usually takes place in small groups of peer teachers, at regular intervals, and over an extended period of time, such as in video "clubs" (Van Es & Sherin, 2010). In studies of these peer groups, teachers were generally guided by a facilitator who focused on a particular approach to teaching or to the subject matter, explored solutions to typical problems, or reviewed how members were implementing a professional development initiative. Through these video-based discussions, teachers developed "a discourse for analyzing video . . . focused on making sense of what occurs in classrooms and using evidence from classroom events to support their analyses" (Van Es & Sherin, 2010, p. 172). Ingram, Louis, and Schroeder (2004) reported that, when engaged in collaboration with peers, teachers were more likely to collect and use data systematically, rather than to rely on anecdotes and intuition. Ebsworth, Feknous, Loyet, and Zimmerman (2004) stated, "Learning is self-directed because [teachers] can choose what to focus on, and when . . . learning through videos emphasizes process, because the process of observation/reflection actually occurs in the [session]" (p. 145).

For teacher educators who facilitate critical reflection on practice with teacher candidates, the use of video as an effective tool has been

widely documented (Harford & MacRuairc, 2008; Newhouse, Lane, & Brown, 2007; Rich & Hannafin, 2009; Rosaen, Lundeberg, Cooper, Fritzen, & Terpstra, 2008; Yerrick, Ross, & Molebash, 2005). Brouwer (2011) reviewed the uses of video within teacher development and categorized it into three applications: (a) orientation, (b) support, and (c) assessment. For orientation and support, teacher educators have used video to demonstrate teaching methods or characteristic professional situations as illustrations of their pedagogical aims. In assessment, teacher educators, especially those engaged in supervision, have used video records of candidates' own teaching to help teacher trainees to develop a realistic picture of their own performance or to evaluate teaching competency (Wang & Hartley, 2003). In all of these ways, video operates as a contextualizing agent, bringing the realities of teaching into teacher educator-candidate discussion for the education of the teacher candidate. But how does viewing videos of teaching affect teacher educators? Although teacher educator professional learning is certain to have occurred in all of the above applications of video for teacher candidate learning, how teacher educators might learn from peer faculty through examination of video has not been a focus of research. The present study was designed to explore what collaborative video inquiry could offer teacher educators.

Method

To extend the research base of video-based conversations to teacher educators, we created the conditions for cross-departmental interaction among faculty, using video as a central artifact through three focus-group sessions. These video artifacts were excerpted from our institutional video library (<http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/school-of-education/technology/vat/overview>), filmed by teacher candidates in their supervised teaching semesters at local P-12 schools. Our research aims were to explore the content of faculty observations of the teaching in the video, the nature of the conversations held between faculty about these videos, and faculty views about their participation in these conversations. A small number of faculty participants ($N=10$) meant that multiple-method and multiple-source data collection and analysis were possible. This design allowed us to interpret the data as a case within a specific context (Stake, 1995).

Context

This study took place at a large, urban college of education that enrolls approximately 2,800 students in a variety of teacher preparation programs, from Early Childhood to Secondary certification areas. There were 68 full-time and 250 part-time faculty in three department areas:

Curriculum and Teaching, Special Education, and Educational Foundations. A requirement for all at teacher candidates was to video-record their teaching in local, urban school settings, as part of their student teaching/practicum courses, excerpt a portion of the lesson, and upload the video to an online video library. When uploading these videos, teacher candidates were required to select descriptors, best represented in the clip, from six categories (see Table 1). To allow these videos to become searchable and retrievable, this lexicon (coding vocabulary) was created to tag the videos. This lexicon reflects practices outlined in the college's observation of teaching rubric but was modified to fit the limitations of the interactive website.

As faculty began searching for videos in the video library, it became apparent that they had assumed that teacher candidates would be able to describe the clip, using terminology familiar to teacher educators. This was a problem for two reasons. First, if the clips were not well-described, they would not be useful to faculty searching for a clip. Second, the faculty had differing definitions for the terms in the lexicon. Where videos had been tagged by faculty from different program areas, a wide range of descriptors was selected. Hence, although the lexicon was developed collaboratively by faculty, it needed to be applied to a variety of videos to negotiate their meanings as a means to become useful to faculty.

Participants

The first phase of the research involved recruiting faculty members from designated program areas to participate in focus groups to view short videos of teaching. Three focus groups were constructed, each with four members.

Focus Group A included faculty members in a single teacher education program, namely a Master's in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) program that leads to Pre-K-12 state certification. Focus Group B was interdisciplinary across a Master's in Elementary Education program that leads to common branch licensure for grades 1-5 and included one faculty member from Childhood Literacy, one from Early Childhood education, and two from TESOL. Focus Group C was interdisciplinary across a Secondary (adolescent) Master's in Education programs. This group included one faculty member from Social Studies, one from English, one from Special Education, and one from TESOL.

These groupings allowed us to examine the content of the conversations and the experience of faculty within and across teacher education disciplines. Three TESOL faculty participated in interdisciplinary groups. All 10 participants (eight female and two male) were experienced teacher

Table 1
Lexical Tags for Videos of Teaching

Category	Descriptor
Grouping	Whole class Small group One-on-one
Phase of lesson	Introduction Teacher presentation Discussion Transition Guided practice Assessment Conclusion
Environment	Physical environment Routines Non-verbal cues Rapport Praise Dealing with disruption Giving instructions Promoting respect Language modeling
Planning	Setting objectives Social expertise Connecting prior knowledge Sequencing of tasks Use of technology Use of materials Critical thinking
Engaging	Student productivity Time on task Responses opportunities Teacher talk vs. student talk Wait time Movement patterns Scaffolding Differentiation of tasks
Assessing	Providing feedback Questioning Circulating Responding to student contributions Checking for understanding Involving students in self-assessment

educators with five to 25 years of experience and were representative of the larger faculty in age (ranging from 30 to 60) and ethnic background (nine Caucasian and one Asian). Four were tenured and six were untenured faculty. All were full-time faculty members who volunteered to participate in the study in response to a letter distributed to all faculty by an administrative assistant. The first author, who is also a TESOL faculty member with prior experience in leading professional development on the use of video analysis, facilitated the focus groups.

Procedures

Three faculty focus groups took place, and each followed the same protocol but with a different video clip and different faculty participants. Each clip was recorded in a P-12 classroom that included ELLs. At each focus group, selected faculty viewed a 15-minute clip of teaching, coded it using the lexicon from the online video library, and discussed what they noticed in the teaching practices in the video. Procedures for these sessions are presented in Table 2.

These focus groups took place for about two hours at the college and were audio-recorded. The videos viewed already were available in the video library and were not analyzed in the research. Group A reviewed a video of a 4th grade English/Social Studies lesson on the book *Bringing the Rain to Kapiti Plain* by Verna Aardema; Group B discussed a 2nd grade lesson on using the five senses to enhance writing with details; and Group C discussed a video of a high school English/Social Studies lesson on the novel *Night* by Elie Wiesel. Teachers in the videos all were successful pre-service teacher candidates who had graduated, and all of the videos had received either “meeting standard” or “exceeding standard” in the observation evaluation. These video-recorded lessons were selected because each classroom had students who were ELLs and in special education mixed with general education students and because the lesson involved multiple disciplines.

Data Collection and Analysis

Ethnographic methods of focus-group interviews and document collection were used, and quantitative analysis of the choices made on the lexical coding instrument was conducted (Yin, 2003). In conjunction, these contributed to a better understanding of how teacher educators from different programs looked at a video of teaching, what they noticed, and what the conversation about that video meant to the group’s members. Data sources included: (a) observation notes taken while watching the video; (b) lexicon items selected by participants to tag the video; (c)

audio-recordings from three focus group sessions; and (d) written reflections as completed by participants at the conclusion of the session.

Focus group interviews in this study served a dual role: as the means for the research to be conducted and as the source of its data. Advantages of focus group interviews include the potential for participants to extend or revise their reflections as they hear the opinions of other group members, the opportunity for contrasting ideas to emerge, and the benefit to participants of lowering anxiety, as they are not alone in the interview process. The rationale for using the focus groups was to increase the quality of each individual's responses, as, in focus groups, according to Patton (1987), "Participants tend to provide checks and balances on each other which weed out false or extreme views" (p. 135).

Table 2
Sequence of the Focus Group Sessions

Session	Activity / Questions
1	Facilitator reads protocol and outlines procedures for the session. These two steps are completed silently and independently.
2	Note-taking sheets in T-chart are shared. Participants are asked to write what they are noticing in the left-hand column and, in the right hand column, their thoughts, questions, and comments.
3	Video of 10-15 minutes is shown. Lexicon for coding the video is distributed, and video is shown a second time, with participants' selecting only one key teaching practice for each of the six domains.
4	Discussion is opened. Prompt questions include: What particular aspects of teaching practice in your discipline were very apparent to you in this clip? What did you feel you wanted to see, but didn't? What was effective according to "best practices" in your discipline area? What was questionable according to "best practices" in your discipline area?
5	Exit questions are distributed and faculty asked to write responses: What did you learn, if anything, from today's focus group viewing of video? How do you see teacher education faculty benefiting from video-based collaborative inquiry? Would you use this video segment of teaching in any of your courses? In what way? What aspects of the video library tagging lexicon would you add or change?

The focus-group interviews were conducted according to a semi-structured interview protocol (Lynch, 1996). An interview guide provides structured questions and is specifically recommended for use in group interviews, as it keeps the interaction focused but also allows individual perspectives and experiences to emerge (Patton, 1987). At the same time, the individual perspectives, unaffected by other participants, were desired; therefore, the protocol steps captured both individual and group responses to the video.

Analysis of the observation notes. As a preliminary step in the coding, the participant faculty's observation notes of the video of teaching were analyzed according to one of the criteria developed by Van Es (2009) in her framework for analyzing video club discussions. The framework articulates what teachers notice (who they focus on, what topics they discuss) and how teachers reason (how they analyze video, level of specificity of ideas) as well as provides a developmental progression for noticing (ranging from basic to extended). Because our participants were all highly experienced teacher educators, they tended to be specific and extended in their "noticing," so only Van Es's first criterion was adopted. An additional criterion, which we added, situated the observation notes as relating to a general pedagogical concern vs. a discipline-specific one. A spreadsheet was created, and faculty's written comments were subdivided into discrete items and then excerpted and inserted into the corresponding parts of the framework: faculty's content area, whether the focus was on teacher or student, the topic discussed in the comment (using the terminology of the lexicon for consistency), and whether the content of the comment could be classified as general pedagogy or discipline-specific pedagogy. This was first done independently by the two authors, and then, in a second round, codes and discrepancies were discussed, and final coding was done by consensus.

Analysis of the lexicon. Simple tallies were used to determine which codes were selected by faculty from different program areas, where overlap existed within a focus group, and the overall frequency of the codes across the three focus groups. This quantitative analysis allowed us to see where there were commonalties in perceptions among the participant faculty as to how the videos should be tagged for the video library.

Analysis of the focus group conversation. Following the procedures outlined by Miller (2009) in his analysis of very similar conversations among teacher candidates, "Codes were created to summarize segments of the conversational and interview data in terms of the content and conversational processes at play in the participants' discourse" (p. 149).

These “conversational segments” were analyzed according to the process of content analysis, as outlined by Bogdan and Biklen (1998). Initially, the same codes as had been used in the analysis of the observation notes were used to guide the excerpting and classifying of the dialogue. These included focus on teacher or student, topic discussed, and focus on general or discipline-specific content. Analysis of who initiated topics, length of turns, and floor control were not analyzed. Although there were aspects of the talk that were akin to naturalistic conversation, the focus group conversations operated more like extended interviews, as the facilitator, at times, prompted participants or posed questions.

Analysis of the written reflections. At the end of the session, participants generated 1- to 2-page written narratives in response to the final questions, as presented in Table 2. These were reviewed using content analysis. Responses were read and reread by both researchers. Then, themes that began to emerge were grouped and codified within each question frame. These included lessons learned from participation, benefits of this activity for faculty generally, foreseeable future use of the video, and aspects of the lexicon to change.

Findings

Observation Notes

Analysis of the faculty observation notes provided insight into their independent, in-the-moment reflections, prior to engaging in discussion with colleagues. All participants wrote copiously, resulting in four to five handwritten pages, for a total of 65 pages of observation notes. Each unique theme was identified and then coded as to its focus (teacher or student), topic discussed (using terms from the lexicon), and content of the comment (general pedagogy or discipline specific). Themes that appeared on at least three segments of faculty notes were then grouped. This resulted in 12 themes identified across the analysis of observation notes from all three focus group sessions. Dominant themes were then categorized according to program faculty, as seen in Table 3.

A review of this coding by program area indicated that the Early Childhood and Special Education faculty tended to make general pedagogical observations and noticed the teacher in relation to her attention to learners’ needs. The Special Education faculty, in a separate focus group, noted questions about the teacher’s degree of knowledge about students’ backgrounds and how this might manifest in choices about seating, activity choices, and behavior management. From both the Early Childhood and Special Education faculty, there were many

Table 3
Themes in Faculty Observation Notes of Video

Program Areas of Faculty			
	Early Childhood and Special Education	English, Literacy, and Social Studies Education	TESOL and English Education
Theme	Focus on teacher's knowledge of learners	Focus on texts	Focus on language use by teacher
Excerpt	"Some kids sitting at separate desks, some kids making sounds. How much pre-knowledge of kids does this teacher have?"	"Students are to write why the peanut butter tastes so good . . . How can they learn to write this effectively? Using mentor texts would be better."	"Teacher emphasizes feather/weather—will she talk about rhyme in story?"
Theme	Focus on ways teacher attempts to engage learners	Focus on depth of knowledge	Focus on vocabulary instruction
Excerpt	"Teacher walks around and sits, students do a turn and talk. Looks like ways in which teacher tried to engage students."	"A little bogus . . . not talking about the real qualities. Technically the lesson very proficient but depth is missing. Not clear if much new was learned."	"Teacher says 'What is a drought?' Give the students a sentence to contextualize it? What about a picture?"
Theme	Focus on instructions and routines	Focus on generating discussion	Focus on language comprehension by students
Excerpt	"Teacher explains directions by modeling and clear language what is this lesson going to be about? No real introduction"	"Teacher tries to direct students by asking questions. I wonder if there is a way to get all students more involved in interpreting text."	"Teacher does not pause during read aloud of story for comprehension check. Why didn't she stop for questions?"
Theme	Focus on behavior and classroom management	Focus on critical stance	Focus on language use by students
Excerpt	"Teacher passes out paper with instructions first. Tells them 'one more minute and then pencils down.' Teacher used three claps to gain students' attention."	"What do you think the author is saying here? Teacher needs to get students to look at this in more complex manner."	"Teacher raises her voice over students talking about their ideas. This was missed opportunity to invite student-to-student talk and them sharing aloud."

comments related to the teacher's use of routines and management of student interactions.

The Literacy and Social Studies faculty tended to focus more on the materials used in the lesson and the impact of the materials on students' critical dialogue. For instance, both questioned the choice of texts as fundamental to the learning and interaction that took place. The English education faculty member also referenced the text but more in terms of questioning whether the teacher in the video had sufficiently challenged the students to dive deeper into the text and to discuss multiple viewpoints on it. This was echoed by the Social Studies faculty, who stated that the field's focus on helping teachers develops rich discussions about texts.

The TESOL and English professors' focus was on language development. They attended to the teachers' and students' use of language in the videos and how the teacher used language and encouraged (or not) students' use of language. A TESOL professor noted, "Teacher seems to ask questions but not allow time for students to prepare responses; students provide one-word answers not conducive to extending language." This was echoed in a statement written by the English faculty member, who noted, "Fishy questions"—teacher looking for students to answer what the teacher knows; teacher positioned as reader. Typical IRE pattern." For the TESOL faculty, the way in which the teacher made the text comprehensible, for example, by addressing the vocabulary's complexity, reflected the teacher's focus on how the lesson could serve to develop students' English language skills.

Video Tagging from the Lexicon

Analysis of the manner that participants from different focus groups tagged videos revealed that faculty from the same content areas tended to agree more on tags to assign to a particular video (see Table 4). Focus Group A, comprised of faculty from the same program, had an average agreement of 92% in all categories. Professors in Focus Group B had an average agreement of only 49%, and faculty in Focus Group C had an average agreement of 63%. In the categories of the lexicon, there was 100% consensus across all three focus groups only in the first category, that of "grouping," although there was a clear majority in the categories of "phase of lesson" and "engaging." More variability was found in the tagging choices made by all the participants for the remaining categories of "environment," "planning," and "assessing." In Focus Group B, there was majority agreement only in the categories of "grouping," "phase of lesson," "environment" and "engaging." In Focus Group C, with par-

participants from four different disciplines, there was majority agreement only in the categories of “grouping,” “phase of lesson,” and “engaging.” For instance, in the category of “phase of lesson,” there were seven tags that could have been chosen to code the video. The participants in Focus Group A all converged on the same tag, while participants of Focus Group B and Focus Group C converged on two different tags. In comparison, in the category of “planning,” there were seven tags that could have been chosen. The participants in Focus Group A chose two different tags, while participants of Focus Group B chose four different ones, and Focus Group C chose three.

Table 4
Results of Lexical Tagging of Videos of Teaching

	Focus Group A (All TESOL)		Focus Group B (Elementary)		Focus Group C (Secondary)		Average Agreement
Grouping	Whole Class (4/4) ^a	100%	Whole Class (4/4)	100%	Whole Class (4/4)	100%	100%
Phase of Lesson	Teacher Presentation (4/4)	100%	Teacher Presentation (3/4) Guided Practice (1/4)	75%	Teacher Presentation (2/4) Discussion (2/4)	50%	75%
Environ- ment	Language Modeling (3/4) Dealing with Disruption (1/4)	75%	Giving Instructions (3/4) Routines (1/4)	75%	Giving Instructions (2/4) Language Modeling (1/4) Rapport (1/4)	50%	67%
Planning	Use of Materials (3/4) Connecting Prior Knowledge (1/4)	75%	Use of Materials (1/4) Sequencing of Tasks (1/4) Connecting Prior Knowledge (1/4) Critical Thinking (1/4)	0%	Sequencing of Tasks (1/4) Setting Objectives (1/4) Critical Thinking (2/4)	50%	42%
Engaging	Teacher Talk vs. Student Talk (4/4)	100%	Teacher Talk vs. Student Talk (3/4) Movement Patterns (1/4)	75%	Scaffolding (1/4) Teacher Talk vs. Student Talk (3/4)	75%	83%
Assess- ing	Responding to Student Contributions (4/4)	100%	Circulating (2/4) Responding to Student Contributions (1/4) Checking for Understanding (1/4)	50%	Checking for Understanding (1/4) Responding to Student Contributions (1/4) Questioning (2/4)	50%	67%
Average Agree- ment by Group		92%		49%		61%	72%

Note. a. Number of participants who chose the term / total participants in group in parentheses.

Focus Group Conversations

While the conversations touched on most aspects of the lesson that faculty had written in their observation notes, only a few themes were sustained for an extensive portion of the talk. In Focus Group A's first conversation, faculty were highly familiar with each other, as they had been colleagues within the same program. Two were more experienced with the K-12 instructional setting. This conversation was "led" by two of the more experienced faculty, who shared what they found most salient in the clip, which was a lack of explicit attention to English language development, apart from addressing content-area vocabulary terms. The conversation centered on questioning whether the lesson was more of a content lesson adapted for ELLs or an English language lesson contextualized through content. The faculty members with more experience in K-12 schools emphasized the importance of this concern. The conversation concluded with a need to engage in this type of video review simply as a means to ensure greater understanding and consistency by applying the observation rubric used to evaluate candidates in the program.

In Focus Group B, the conversation began with several commendations of the teacher's classroom management and use of hands-on activities that appeared to engage all students. The video was of a candidate who worked in an all-Muslim girls' school, in which the majority of the girls as well as the teacher wore a "hijab," a head covering. This appeared to be novel to the two faculty members who were not TESOL faculty, as they had not observed candidates in such settings. The conversation then shifted to a discussion of what had been salient to the group, and concerns were raised by the Literacy professor, who also was the most senior faculty member in the group, about a perceived lack of meaningful talk among students. All of the faculty then began to take a more critical look at the teacher's use of modeling, questioning, and even the appropriateness of the hands-on activity that had earlier been praised. The Early Childhood professor challenged the Literacy professor to consider the aspects of playful learning that were taking place within the table groups. The conversation ended with an agreement that each of the participants found the discussion enlightening and realized how other faculty members helped them to see more in the video than what they had initially noticed.

The third conversation, within Focus Group C, began with a very critical review of the lesson's shortcomings. The English professor focused on the ways that the teacher attempted to promote critical reflection about a particular passage in the novel but failed to do so due to

persistent patterns in her classroom discourse. These typical teacher ask-student, respond-teacher evaluate discourse patterns appeared to curtail rather than to extend student responses. The Special Education faculty member, who was the most seasoned in classroom observation and clinical work, then discussed, at some length, the ways in which the classroom seating, organizational patterns, and teacher behaviors failed to promote student-to-student learning and preserved the teacher's dominance. The TESOL and Social Studies teacher educators had less experience in classrooms and were the least vocal. This conversation concluded with these two faculty members' strongly asserting how useful they had found the conversation, as, in listening, they discovered much to be learned from their colleagues.

Overall, the conversations took place for approximately 45 minutes, and, in each group, the more senior or more experienced faculty in classroom observation took the lead in sharing what they noticed in the video. This may have been because they felt more confident with taking observational notes and reducing these into teaching skills that they know to be difficult or persistent in their observations of teaching in the field. The less experienced (in terms of field observation) initially deferred to the other faculty members but then brought up what they had observed, often in the form of a question to the group. The faculty were generally fairly critical of the teaching, with much more attention given to what was missing in the lesson than to what was successful.

Written Reflections

Faculty concluded the conversations by commenting on the value of participating in the focus groups. In response to the first prompt on what they felt they had learned, all 10 stated that they felt that it was a positive and an educative experience.

First, the "importance of teachers participating in collaborative discussion as a method of professional development" was emphasized. One faculty member stated, "I think it's very enlightening to hear what others see in the same lesson; it opens my eyes to things I missed or didn't give enough weight to." Second, the richness of video was cited as an excellent medium for examining teaching. As one faculty stated, "The things I noticed were only a few of the things one COULD notice."

The experience also appeared to illustrate for participants that they each, even within the same disciplines, had ways of looking at teaching that reflected their personal priorities and beliefs about effective practice. One faculty stated, "We do notice broadly similar patterns of teacher quality and activity, but we prioritize these aspects and discuss them

in different ways.” Even within the focus group made up of all faculty from the TESOL program, one faculty member stated:

I learned from this experience that critiquing teaching is difficult and that even among educators of the same discipline, we have points that we look at differently. It may not be practical to double rate a large amount of student work but the process would show us our biases and what there is to learn and discuss with each other. I think we should do more of it. My colleagues made some interesting points that I'd like to hear more about.

In considering how the lexicon could be improved to support the work of faculty, responses included separating general from content-specific terminology, reducing overlapping items, and providing more examples and explanations for what each of the terms means. Finally, faculty shared their beliefs about how video-based collaborative inquiry might benefit teacher educators generally. They cited a number of potential benefits, including:

- “exposure to other perspectives that can enrich our own teaching and viewpoints”;
- “a refinement of what to look for when reviewing teaching—more awareness of the criteria we focus on and our blind spots”;
- “a scaffold for teacher educators to apply what was discussed to their own teaching”;
- “insight into interdisciplinary viewpoints”;
- “greater understanding of the instructional practices for ELLs and Special Education students”;
- “a chance to come together as colleagues around the instruction of our teacher candidates rather than around administrative items.”

Two faculty also expressed concern about how such work could be sustained or even incorporated into the work of teacher educators. One expression of this concern was: “I really enjoyed participating and I feel I learned a lot from my colleagues and the video analysis in only a couple of hours, but I wonder how this work would be rewarded.” Another faculty concluded by stating:

We should be able to come to a better shared understanding of what good practice looks like in the real world, and be better able to communicate that to our students. This knowledge can specifically be used in seminars where we need to be showing models of good and “developing” instructional practice and agreement among ourselves on what those models are should be the first step.

Faculty comments such as these revealed a sense of urgency for looking at the performance of teachers as essential work. One faculty member stated, “Without norming with each other and coming back to some common benchmark, we risk going off on our own tangents.”

Discussion

A revisiting of the three dilemmas in faculty professional learning, presented at the start of this article serves to situate the findings from our investigation. First, these focus groups were authentic faculty-to-faculty learning opportunities of the mentoring process that Ball et al. (2009) described as significantly absent from teacher education. In the focus group of all TESOL educators, although the terminology and orientation toward the video were shared, the varying background experiences of the faculty still offered opportunity for new lenses through which to view and evaluate teaching. The more highly experienced members of the group led the conversation, speaking more at length, and served to direct the nature of the reflection. Less-experienced faculty reported gaining from witnessing how the more-experienced members would evaluate the teaching in the video, which served as a sort of norming event. Because the teacher candidate was from their program, there was a sense of personal responsibility for the teaching demonstrated in the video and investment in the conversation as relevant to future program improvements. This is consistent with the research of Rickard, McAvinia, and Quirke-Bolt (2009), who found that faculty benefited when reviewing video records of candidates in their programs. The discussion about what was effective or missing in the instruction was brief, as this group moved quickly to discuss how coursework may or may not have sufficiently built capacity for this candidate. Specifically, the TESOL faculty was struggling with the balance between content instruction and language development in the lesson and related this to a failure of some of the courses to sufficiently distinguish scaffolding content for ELLs from English language development.

In the other two interdisciplinary focus groups, faculty-to-faculty learning also was highly evident and illustrated how departmentalization within teacher education, as described by Hardman (2009), may be hindering opportunities for learning across disciplines. Initially, each member of the group offered a perspective particularly associated with methods in their fields. For instance, the Early Childhood teacher educator focused on the teacher’s body language, and the Special Education faculty member focused on the teacher’s knowledge of the learners. The Social Studies and English faculty questioned the ways that the teacher

developed a critical stance toward authorship in examining the text, and the Literacy educator looked at how texts were being resourced in the lesson. As the Special Educator and TESOL faculty entered the dialogue with their content-area colleagues, they were able to display their specialized knowledge of learner needs, both cognitively and linguistically, and this expertise was highly valued by their peers. As in our study, Devereaux, Prater, Jackson, Heath, and Carter (2010), in their research on the impact of professional development on Special Education faculty, found that collaboration was a key lever in generating self-evaluation, change in practice, and greater interest in further professional interaction. Creese (2006) has shown the importance of equal status and a shared lexicon in successful collaborations between TESOL and content teachers, and this was apparent in these faculty dialogues.

The need for a shared lexicon to support teacher educators' common discourse has been identified by Grossman and McDonald (2008). Evident in the observation notes was that faculty have different ways of naming classroom instructional behaviors and different foci in what is important or salient. The variability in the way that professors in different fields tagged the videos suggests that they viewed videos of teaching through different lenses. However, through discussion, these differences became learning opportunities. As one faculty member listened to the observations of another, they nodded in agreement and followed up with how they would not have attended to that particular feature but that, once pointed out, they could see its importance. Faculty selections on the video tagging lexicon clearly showed how a use of terms could be a way forward to develop a shared vocabulary for teaching, although the meaning behind the selections always would need to be probed and developed through collaborative dialogue.

Although not generalizable to other such activities or to other institutions due to the limited number of participants and limited scope, we found that the experience of the participants was a meaningful one, with great potential for replication. These types of activities are easily accomplished, involve teacher educators as coordinators of professional development, and could yield great dividends for teacher educator development.

Conclusion

As long as the culture of higher education rewards individual achievements, is structured along departmental boundaries, and valorizes unique research interests that are apart from the work of teacher preparation itself, faculty-to-faculty peer learning may be an infrequent

event. However, if teacher educator development is anything like teacher development, considerations for designing professional learning might include features that appeared to be effective in this study: interdisciplinarity, a focus on instruction, use of artifacts, and an interactional rather than transactional nature. Such authentic conversations among teacher educators were characterized by Kitchen, Ciuffetelli Parker, and Gallagher (2008) as being voluntary; taking place on common ground; involving safety, trust, and care; possessing meaningful content; and being dynamic and evolutionary.

While Ball et al. (2009) urged teacher education to provide support for new faculty, we believe the same is true for all faculty. One way forward for faculty professional learning may lie in the development of open-ended experiences that bring together faculty from disparate disciplines and a range of experience levels around the act of teaching as demonstrated by the institution's candidates. We suggest that such faculty development activities could involve the creation of (a) a common vocabulary to describe teaching behaviors that could be shared across a school of education; (b) available video records of teaching from local candidates from which commentary about the instruction could be captured from diverse program faculty; and (c) regular opportunities for interdepartmental investigations of teaching through video.

Because teacher education is being held accountable for preparing teachers of all children, we cannot afford to stay within the comfortable confines and routines of our familiar discipline areas. We have the expertise within our larger schools of education to provide the preparation necessary for our teacher candidates but only if we join forces, collaborating to build our expertise. Development of video discussion groups could have an impact on how teacher education does business, helping us to see how our programs and courses need to adjust as a means to develop the competencies we seek, thus building stronger connections between course preparation and field performance. The focus on what our teachers do, as seen in video records or other artifacts produced by our candidates, must be afforded a central place in the learning of teacher educators.

References

- Baeher, L., Rorimer, S., & Smith, L. (2012). Video-mediated teacher collaborative inquiry: Focus on English language learners. *The High School Journal*, 95(3), 49-61.
- Ball, D. L., Sleep, L., Boerst, T. A., & Bass, H. (2009). Combining the development of practice and the practice of development in teacher education. *The Elementary School Journal*, 109(5), 458-474.

- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity* (Roundtable report). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research in education. An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3-15.
- Brouwer, N. (2011). Imaging teacher learning: A literature review on the use of digital video for preservice teacher education and professional development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Creese, A. (2006). Supporting talk? Partnership teachers in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 9(4), 434-453.
- Cuenca, A. (2010). Self-study research: Surfacing the art of pedagogy in teacher education. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 3(2), 15-29.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 35-47.
- Devereaux, T., Prater, M., Jackson, A., Heath, M., & Carter, N. J. (2010). Special education faculty perceptions of participating in a culturally responsive professional development program. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(4), 263-278.
- Dinkelmann, T. (2003). Self-study in teacher education: A means and ends tool for promoting reflective teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(1), 6-18.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Ebsworth, M. E., Feknous, B., Loyet, D., & Zimmerman, S. (2004). Tape it yourself: Videotapes for teacher education. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 145-154.
- Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large-scale reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 1, 1-23.
- Gallagher, T., Griffin, S., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., Kitchen, J., & Figg, C. (2011). Establishing and sustaining teacher educator professional development in a self-study community of practice: Pre-tenure teacher educators developing professionally. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), 880-890.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Education Research Journal*, 38(4), 915-945.
- Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 184-205.
- Hahn, T., & Lester, J. (2012). Faculty needs and preferences for professional development. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 53(2), 82-97.
- Hardman, M. L. (2009). Redesigning the preparation of all teachers within the framework of an integrated program model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(4), 583-587.

- Harford, J., & MacRuairc, G. (2008). Engaging student teachers in meaningful reflective practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(7), 1884-1892.
- Hennessy, S., & Deaney, R. (2009). "Intermediate theory" building: Integrating multiple teacher and researcher perspectives through in-depth video analysis of pedagogic strategies. *Teachers College Record, 111*(7), 1753-1795.
- Hiebert, J., & Morris, A. K. (2009). Building a knowledge base for teacher education: An experience in K-8 mathematics teacher preparation. *The Elementary School Journal, 109*(5), 475-490.
- Ingram, D., Louis, K. R. S., & Schroeder, R. (2004). Accountability policies and teacher decision making: Barriers to the use of data to improve practice. *Teachers College Record, 106*(6), 1258-1287
- Imig, D., Wiseman, D., & Imig, S. (2011). Teacher education in the United States of America, 2011. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 37*(4), 399-408.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2011). The knowledges of teacher education: Developing a critical complex epistemology. In K. Tobin, K. Hayes, & S. Steinberg (Eds.), *Key works in critical pedagogy* (pp. 227-243). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Kitchen, J., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., & Gallagher, T. (2008). Authentic conversation as faculty development: Establishing a self-study group in a faculty of education. *Studying Teacher Education: Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices, 4*(2), 157-171.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2011). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55-72). New York: Routledge.
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam, S., & Caffarella, R. S. (1998). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, D. M. J. (2009). Talking about our troubles: Using video-based dialogue to build preservice teachers' professional knowledge. *The Teacher Educator, 44*(3), 143-163.
- Nelson, T., & Slavit, D. (2008). Supported teacher collaborative inquiry. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(1), 99-116.
- Newhouse, C. P., Lane, J. M., & Brown, C. L. (2007). Reflecting on teaching practices using digital video representation in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 1-12.
- O'Hara, S., & Pritchard, R. H. (2008). Meeting the challenge of diversity: Professional development for teacher educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(1), 43-61.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Plecki, M. L., Elfers, A. M., & Nakamura, Y. (2012). Using evidence for teacher education program improvement and accountability: An illustrative case of the role of value-added measures. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(5), 318-334.
- Pugach, M. C., Blanton, L. P., & Correa, V. I. (2011). A historical perspective on the role of collaboration in teacher education reform making good on the

- promise of teaching all students. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 34(3), 183-200.
- Rich, P.J., & Hannafin, M. (2009). Video annotation tools: Technologies to scaffold, structure, and transform teacher reflection. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(1), 52-67.
- Rickard, A., McAvinia, C., & Quirke-Bolt, N. (2009). The challenge of change: Digital video-analysis and constructivist teaching approaches on a one-year preservice teacher education program in Ireland. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 17(3), 349-367.
- Rosaen, C.L., Lundeberg, M., Cooper, M., Fritzen, A., & Terpstra, M. (2008). Noticing noticing: How does investigation of video records change how teachers reflect on their experiences? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 347-360.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1-16.
- Van Es, E. A. (2009). Participants' roles in the context of a video club. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 18(1), 100-137.
- Van Es, E., & Sherin, M. (2010). The influence of video clubs on teachers' thinking and practice. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 13(2), 155-176.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2006). Review on [of?] professional learning communities: What do we know? Paper presented at the NSRF [Please spell out] Research Forum. Retrieved from http://www.nsrffharmony.org/research.vescio_ross_adams.pdf
- Wang, J., & Hartley, K. (2003). Video technology as a support for teacher education reform. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 105-138.
- Welsch, R., & Devlin, P. (2007). Developing preservice teachers' reflection: Examining the use of video. *Action in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 53-61.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Yerrick, R., Ross, D., & Molebash, P. (2005). Too close for comfort: Real-time science teaching reflections via digital video editing. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 16(4), 351-375.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, K. S. (2011). Institutional separation in schools of education: Understanding the functions of space in general and special education teacher preparation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2), 483-493.
- Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION*, 21(2), 117-124.